

## *A within-country study of leadership perceptions and outcomes across native and immigrant employees: Questioning the universality of transformational leadership*

ANN-LOUISE HOLTEN,<sup>\*</sup> ANNE BØLLINGTOFT,<sup>\*\*</sup> ISABELLA GOMES CARNEIRO<sup>§</sup> AND VILHELM BORG<sup>||</sup>

---

### **Abstract**

This study investigates the universality of transformational leadership with respect to employee perceptions and three outcomes: job satisfaction, self-rated health, and well-being. We do so among employees of different national and cultural backgrounds, yet within a shared national and sectorial setting. Our study has a repeated measures design based on survey data from 2,947 employees (2,836 natives Danes and 111 immigrants) in the Danish elder care sector. While we find no difference between native Danes and immigrants in their perception of transformational leadership, we find that transformational leadership is not a universal predictor of outcomes. Although transformational leadership predicts change in none of the outcomes for immigrants, it does predict change in job satisfaction and well-being for native Danes. Based on our findings, we suggest applying a combination of universalistic and contingency paradigms when leading composite employee groups.

**Keywords:** transformational leadership, immigrants, global leadership, universality

Received 31 August 2015. Accepted 11 January 2017

---

### **INTRODUCTION**

In a globalized world, the question of whether leadership has universal effects becomes crucial. This study focuses on transformational leadership, which consistently has been demonstrated to be associated with positive employee effects (for a meta-analysis see Judge & Piccolo, 2004) and performance (Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996; Bass, 1999; Avolio, Reichard, Hannah, Walumbwa, & Chan, 2009). Building on ‘the happy-productive employee thesis’ (Wright & Staw, 1999), which suggests that employee well-being and performance are associated, we test the universality claim of transformational leadership. The universality claim assumes that the defining transformational leadership behaviours are universally endorsed as outstanding (Den Hartog, House, Hanges, Ruiz-Quintanilla, & Dorfman, 1999) and have robust effects (Bass, 1997). Inspired by Lonner (1980), Bass (1997) describes five types of universals: the simple (when a phenomenon is constant across the world), the variform (when a general principle is constant, but may be *enacted* differently across culture), the functional (when relations are constant and invariant across cultures), the systematic (when a sequence or organization of behaviours are constant across cultures), and the

---

\* Department of Psychology, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark

\*\* Department of Management, Aarhus University, Aarhus, Denmark

§ National Cancer Registration and Analysis Service and Cancer Research, London, England

|| The National Research Centre for the Working Environment, Copenhagen, Denmark

Corresponding author: ann-louise.holten@psy.ku.dk

variform functional type (when a relationship is constant but the magnitude may vary across cultures). In contrast to many universality studies, we do not investigate the constancy, enactment, and effects of transformational leadership across countries and cultures. Instead, we hold the national context constant and investigate a participant sample varying on national and cultural backgrounds. Contrasting the universalities to the contingency theory of leadership, we test the universality claim of transformational leadership with regard to both its perception and its effects relative to three outcomes: job satisfaction, self-rated health, and well-being.

Over the past decade, transformational leadership has dominated leadership research (Walumbwa & Wernsing, 2012; Dinh, Lord, Gardner, Meuser, Liden, & Hu, 2014), and it has had a massive impact on both leadership science and practice (Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993; Conger, Kanungo, & Menon, 2000; Antonakis, 2012). The transformational leader works to ensure alignment between the needs of followers and company goals, thereby aiming for performance beyond expectation. In the transformational leadership literature, performance beyond expectation refers to the followers being influenced to transcend their self-interest for the greater good of the organization, as opposed to transactional leadership, which is limited to inducing basic exchanges with followers (Bass, 1985). Indeed, transformational leadership has been associated with employees' image of the 'ideal' leader (Bass & Avolio, 1989). This notion of transformational leadership as being close to a prototypical perception of the 'ideal' leader is coherent with the view that transformational leadership is universal – thus transcending cultural boundaries (Bass, 1997, 1999) and evoking similar positive effects across countries (Bass & Bass, 2009; Jung, Yammarino, & Lee, 2009). The universalistic notion of a unitary construct of transformational leadership has, nonetheless, been debated (Bass & Bass, 2009) and heavily criticized (Van Knippenberg & Sitkin, 2013), reflecting a more general, scientific call for contextualized perspectives in organizational behaviour research (Klimoski, 2013; Härtel & O'Connor, 2014).

Current trends of globalization and diversity at work further underline the need for investigation of the proposed universality of transformational leadership (Kumar & Chhokar, 2012). These trends pose several challenges for managers (Dickson, Castaño, Magomaeva, & Den Hartog, 2012), for instance, that of knowing how individuals with different national and cultural backgrounds perceive managerial actions. Many companies employ individuals from different national and cultural backgrounds and the composition of employee groups is both changing and dynamic. Investigating the universality of transformational leadership becomes highly important for companies with such composite employee groups. Cultural sensitivity, interpreted as being open to a variety of different environments and cultures, is indeed a competence, which global leaders perceive to be important to acquire (Terrell & Rosenbusch, 2013) and subsequently apply. With the purpose of facilitating global leadership skills, the challenges of globalization and diversity call for an increased understanding of how leadership is perceived and fosters outcomes across employee nationality and culture – and consequently to which extent transformational leadership is universal or contingent upon the national and cultural backgrounds of employees.

The present study contributes with an empirical investigation of the perceptions and outcomes of transformational leadership across native and immigrant employees, thereby contributing to the exploration of the universality or cultural contingency of transformational leadership. There are different ways to conceptualize the construct of culture. In the current study, we adopt a common approach, which is to use proxies (country of birth and citizenship) in order to characterize and operationalize culture (for a similar approach see Soares, Farhangmehr, & Shoham, 2007). Our research question is the following: Is the perception and effects of transformational leadership universal across native and immigrant employee groups within a shared national context (Denmark)? As opposed to other cross-national studies, our study thus contributes to the extant leadership literature in the following five ways: (1) it pushes for a theoretical development of transformational leadership

theory towards embracing the conditions and potential limits of its universality, (2) it offers a different approach to the testing of transformational leadership universality by performing a within-country study, thus addressing a highly relevant condition for companies with composite employee groups, (3) it identifies a need for a more explicit integration of the leadership perspective with aspects and consequences of globalization, (4) it is performed within a natural organizational context, thus contrasting with the experimental student sample settings commonly applied in other studies (Jung & Yammarino, 2001; Ergeneli, Gohar, & Temirbekova, 2007; Jung, Yammarino, & Lee, 2009), and (5) it applies a repeated measures study design consequently enabling the investigation of both causal relations and change over time, thus responding to calls for follow-up studies within both leadership (Kuoppala, Lamminpää, Liira, & Vainio, 2008) and immigration research (Olesen et al., 2012).

This paper is structured in the following way: first, we outline the theoretical background of our hypotheses development, followed by a description of the methods by which we test our hypotheses. We then present and discuss our results and finally propose our conclusions and recommendations for future research and practise.

## THEORY AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

Based on a review of the leadership literature more than 40 years ago, Stogdill (1974) concluded that there are almost as many definitions of leadership as there are persons, who have attempted to define the concept. Leadership has for instance been defined in terms of both traits, behaviours, and role relationships (Day & Antonakis, 2013). Most definitions, however, reflect the assumption that leadership involves a process whereby one person exerts intentional influence over others with the purpose of guiding, structuring, and facilitating activities and relationships in organizations (Yukl, 2002). Transformational and transactional leadership are two important examples of leadership styles that focus on intentionally influencing followers.

The roots of transformational leadership are often attributed to the works of political scientist James Burns (1978). Burns (1978) used the term 'transforming leadership' to describe leaders who seek to satisfy the higher order needs of their employees in order to engage them. He argued that transforming leadership occurs when leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality. This should be seen in contrast to transacting leadership, which motivates followers by appealing to their self-interest through the exchange of pay and status for work effort.

Transformational leadership remains interesting to study for several reasons: First, it belongs to one of the most dominant leadership paradigms, often referred to as The New Leadership School (Day & Antonakis, 2012, 2013; Dinh et al., 2014). Second, research has consistently found transformational leadership to be positively associated with employee performance (Lowe et al., 1996; Bass, 1999; Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Avolio et al., 2009). Third, transformational leadership has been associated with employees' job satisfaction (Braun, Peus, Weisweiler, & Frey, 2013), well-being (Arnold, Turner, Barling, Kelloway, & Mckee, 2007), and potentially also health – even though research on this relation still remains inconclusive (Nyberg, Bernin, & Theorell, 2005). Fourth, consistent claims to universal transformational leadership effects have been made (Bass, 1997). Inspired by the massive attention, impact, reputation, and universality claim of transformational leadership, the current study investigates whether transformational leadership is indeed universal, or if it is contingent upon nationality and cultural background. The identification of boundary conditions has been targeted as crucial in leadership research (Antonakis, Avolio, & Sivasubramaniam, 2003). Certainly, in the evolution of theories, transformational leadership has now reached the point at which critical review and identification of such boundary conditions are relevant.

## Contingent and universal leadership paradigms

In the leadership literature, two general paradigms of leadership have emerged: the contingency paradigm and the universalistic paradigm. Both paradigms are represented within transformational leadership research.

Within the contingency paradigm, leadership is understood to be dependent on situations (Hersey & Blanchard, 1969), cognitive states and traits (Fiedler, 1986), or decision-making processes (Vroom & Jago, 2007). Further, a cultural contingency model of leadership has been proposed, focussing on cross-cultural leadership and organizational change (Muczyk & Holt, 2008). Within the cultural strand of transformational leadership research, studies have investigated whether certain cultures elicit higher degrees of transformational leadership (Ergeneli, Gohar, & Temirbekova, 2007) and whether individual elements of transformational leadership are weighed differently across cultures and countries (Ardichvili & Gasparishvili, 2001). However, the cultural strand has mainly focussed on racial and national differences (Shelton, 2007). Jung and Yammarino (2001) found, for example, that transformational leadership has stronger effects on group potency among Asian Americans, while stronger effects on self-efficacy among Caucasian Americans. With Hofstede's dimensions of national culture as point of departure, the GLOBE project found differences in preferred leadership across national clusters (see e.g., House, Javidan, Hanges, & Dorfman, 2002; Wanasika, Howell, Littrell, & Dorfman, 2011). More recently, Engelen, Schmidt, Strenger, and Brettel (2014) found that national culture affects the strength of the relation between top management's transformational leadership behaviours and innovation orientation. Further, Dickson et al. (2012) established that culture predictably matters for the emergence, development, and selection of leaders, while Leong and Fischer (2011) found that leadership behaviours covary with cultural values, such that managers in more egalitarian cultures reveal more transformational leadership behaviours.

The universalistic approach, also referred to as the 'one-size-fits-all' approach (Shamir, 2012), suggests that there are universal leadership models that hold generic leadership functions and behaviours (see for instance, Hamlin, 2007). Bass (1997) describes transformational leadership to be 'a systematic behavioural universal', underpinned by an underlying theory and model, which is systematically universal. Only slight contingencies and variation may occur because 'the same concepts may contain specific thought processes, beliefs, implicit understandings, or behaviours in one culture but not another' (Bass, 1997: 132). In support of this, Walumbwa, Orwa, Wang, and Lawler (2007) find that, although transformational leadership explained more variance in their American sample, transformational leadership had similar impacts on employees' commitment and satisfaction across the United States and Kenya. An example of such cultural variance within the universalistic approach is proposed by Jung, Bass, and Sosik (1995) suggesting that, despite being universal, transformational leadership is more likely to appear in collectivistic rather than individualistic cultures. Walumbwa and Lawler (2003) found that collectivism moderated the impact of transformational leadership on employees' commitment and satisfaction in China, India, and Kenya. Although both quantitative (Den Hartog et al., 1999) and qualitative studies (Karakitapoglu-Aygun & Gumusluoglu, 2013) have supported the notion of universal transformational leadership, the universalistic notion of a unitary construct of transformational leadership has recently been severely criticized by Van Knippenberg and Sitkin (2013). Among other things, they suggest to investigate the potential variation of transformational leadership by its conceptual dimensions, levels (e.g., individual and group), and outcomes.

In summary, the extant literature still represents contingency and universality as two paradigms with fundamental differences in the role and importance they ascribe to culture and nationality in leadership. Following the recent developments in transformational leadership research, the current study challenges and investigates this divide.

Transformational leadership falls within one of the identified culturally endorsed implicit leadership theories of the GLOBE study (Javidan, Dorfman, de Luque, & House, 2006), that is the charismatic,

value-based leadership. However, the method of comparing a phenomenon (transformational leadership) across countries – as is done in the GLOBE project (House et al., 2002) – may not fully answer the question of universality. In part because nationality may not be the only relevant contextual factor for employees' perception of leadership (Jepson, 2009) – in part because employment contexts may vary significantly across nations, thereby potentially confounding the results. Our design allows us to investigate whether transformational leadership differences, related to the country of birth and citizenship of employees, can be established beyond the probable assimilation occurring for employees within a shared national work context. According to the Hofstede cultural dimensions, the Danish culture is characterized by being highly individualistic and feminine, with a very low power distance and uncertainty avoidance (Hofstede, 1984). This cultural orientation suggests that culturally fitting leadership in Denmark should be coaching and allowing for employee autonomy. Furthermore, as there is a low need for work life structure and predictability, effective management should be supportive and involving (<https://geert-hofstede.com/denmark.html>). Still, there are different understandings of the relation between cultural dimensions and leadership. Walumbwa, Lawler, and Avolio (2007) suggest that collectivistic cultures respond more positively to transformational leadership than individualistic cultures, the latter being more responsive to transactional leadership. To clarify relations between national and cultural background and the perception and effect of leadership more research is needed in this area.

## Hypotheses

The hypotheses, we develop in this study, refer to both the universality in perception and outcomes of transformational leadership. With regard to employees' *perception* of leadership, research does not draw a conclusive picture. In the defence of universalism, Den Hartog et al. (1999) find that several transformational leadership attributes are universally attributed to outstanding leadership. Lankau and Chung (2009) also find a high level of cross-cultural consistency in the perception of what constitutes a successful manager, a finding that would argue for cultural convergence towards Western leadership theories and universality. Contrarily, Yan and Hunt (2005) argue that cultural differences do exert an influence on employees' perception of leadership and leadership effectiveness, and Popper and Druryan (2001) find significant differences in leadership perceptions across nationalities. Gerstner and Day (1994) further find that culture and origin is associated with the degree (most, moderately, or least) to which traits are considered to be characteristic of business leaders. Thus, cultural groups may potentially vary in their understanding of what constitutes effective leadership. Differences in perception may be related to different employee interpretations, as was shown with regard to the impact of justice perceptions in the study by Avery, Tonidandel, Volpone, and Raghuram (2010) and/or to leaders' different treatment of employees, as shown in the applicant accent study by Hosoda and Stone-Romero (2010). At the cognitive psychological level, the relation between culture and leadership is by Hanges, Lord, and Dickson (2000) explained by the development and impact of values and self-constructs developed throughout life. Cultural meaning systems are shared between individuals and are composed by beliefs, norms, and values. Hanges, Lord, and Dickson (2000) suggest that these cultural meaning systems are well established in individuals and activate or inhibit which traits are associated with leadership. Notwithstanding a potential convergence towards Western leadership theories, we propose that the universality theory will not find support and employees with different national origins (native vs. immigrant) will perceive transformational leadership differently. We therefore hypothesize that:

Hypothesis 1: Native and immigrant employees will differ in their perception of transformational leadership.

With reference to the effects on employee *outcomes* of leadership in general and transformational leadership in particular, most research has been performed within a Western context

(Steers, Sanchez-Runde, & Nardon, 2012). Nonetheless, some positive associations between transformational leadership and work outcomes (e.g., job performance, affective organizational commitment, turn-over intentions) have also been found in a non-Western context (Miao, Newman, & Lamb, 2012). However, these findings do not respond to the question of whether the effects of transformational leadership remain universal or not. In an experiment, Jung and Avolio (1999) tested the effects of leadership contingent upon cultural orientations and found that students with individualistic orientations (Caucasians) would produce more with a transactional leader than with a transformational and that students with collectivistic orientations (Asian) would produce more with a transformational than a transactional leader. From the perspective of *outcomes*, we therefore propose that there will be an impact of national and cultural background (native vs. immigrant) such that the universality theory will not find support with regard to the effects of transformational leadership on individual outcomes. We suggest the following:

Hypothesis 2: Transformational leadership affects individual outcomes (job satisfaction, self-rated health, and well-being) differently for employees with native Danish and immigrant backgrounds.

We propose this hypothesis to be confirmed in analytical models both with and without control for the baseline outcome levels. When controlling for baseline levels, the outcome reflects the change over time in job satisfaction, self-rated health, and well-being that is affected by transformational leadership.

## METHODS

### Procedure and participants

Data stem from a large cohort study investigating work environment and self-rated health of employees in the Danish public sector, specifically within the elder care. Data were collected from the fall of 2006 to the spring of 2007 (T1) and from the fall of 2008 to the spring of 2009 (T2). At both times, questionnaires were administered in the 35 Danish municipalities that agreed to participate in the study (out of a total of 98 invited municipalities). All measures were assessed at both time points. At T1, 15,697 employees received the questionnaire and a total of 10,065 questionnaires were completed and returned (response rate 64%). At T2, 13,945 employees received the questionnaire and a total of 8,437 were completed and returned (response rate 63%). The questionnaire was answered by 5,206 individuals at both T1 and T2. As we focus on employee perceptions and outcomes of transformational leadership, we excluded 552 managers from the study sample. Due to nonavailable information on country of birth and citizenship, we furthermore excluded 1,707 respondents. Thus excluding dropouts and newcomers, the final sample for analysis consists of 2,947 respondents (2,836 native Danes and 111 immigrants), in that manner representing a larger sample than applied in prior studies (Popper & Druyan, 2001).

For the native group, the mean age was 48 with an average of 11 years of employment. In total, 98% were women and all participating managers were female. Of the 111 immigrant participants, 70.8% were born in Europe, 0.9% in North America, 3.8% in South and Central America, 7.5% in Africa, 11.3% in Asia, and 5.7% in the Middle East. The mean age within the immigrant group was 46 with an average of 7 years of employment at the current workplace. In total, 92% were women. The female predominance of the sample is a consequence of the elder care profession targeted in the study. The educational programmes for elder care professionals vary in duration (7 weeks, 12 months, 14 months, 36 months, and 42 months). Consequently, in the care of the elderly, the employees have different educational backgrounds and tasks. The distribution of educational level was similar for the Danish and immigrant groups.



## Measures

### *Transformational leadership*

The independent variable transformational leadership was measured by a 7-item approximated Danish translation of the 7-item *Global Transformational Leadership scale* (Carless, Wearing, & Mann, 2000). The measure targets the leadership behaviours of the immediate manager. An example item is: 'My manager communicates a clear and positive vision of the future'. Response categories were on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 'to a very large extent' to 'to a very small extent'. Cronbach's  $\alpha$  was 0.92 at T1 and 0.93 at T2. The Global Transformational Leadership scale 7-component measure of transformational leadership has been found to have high convergent validity with the lengthier Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) (Carless, Wearing, & Mann, 2000).

### *Job satisfaction*

Job satisfaction was measured using a 2-item measure focussing on client-related work. An example item is: 'Do you find that you become happier by working with clients?' Response categories were on a 5-point scale ranging from 'to a very large extent' to 'to a very small extent' Cronbach's  $\alpha$  was 0.83 at T1 and 0.82 at T2.

### *General self-rated health*

General self-rated health was measured using a single item from the SF-36: 'In general, would you say your health is ...' (Bjørner et al., 2005). Response categories were on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 'excellent' to 'poor'. This single-item measure has been found to perform as well as the SF-36 multi-item self-reported health (DeSalvo, Fan, McDonell, & Fihn, 2005).

### *Well-being*

Well-being was measured using the WHO-5 well-being scale (Bech, Olsen, Kjoller, & Rasmussen, 2003). This scale has been widely used and validated in several languages across the world (Topp, Østergaard, Søndergaard, & Bech, 2015). An example item is: 'How much of the time in the last two weeks did you feel active and energetic?' Response categories were on a 6-point scale ranging from 'all the time' to 'at no time'. Cronbach's  $\alpha$  was 0.86 at T1 and 0.88 at T2. For reasons of clarity and comparison, we transformed response values for all measures into a 0–100 scale (100 indicating the highest possible rating of each item).

### *Immigrant status*

Information on immigrant status (records of participants' country of birth and citizenship) was obtained and imported to our data set from the Danish Central Office of Civil Registration. A participant was categorized as Dane, if at least one of the parents was a Danish citizen. A participant was categorized as immigrant, if none of the parents were Danish citizens.

## Data analysis

To investigate the *perception* of transformational leadership, we performed the following three procedures: (1) independent sample *T*-tests to investigate potential differences in mean levels of transformational leadership (scale and item levels), job satisfaction, well-being, and self-rated health between the native Danish and the immigrant group; (2) principal component analyses with Varimax rotation to examine potential differences (on the entire sample, the native Danish group, and the immigrant group) in pattern and magnitude of item loadings on transformational leadership; and (3) intercorrelations, means, and standard deviations for the seven transformational leadership items

separately for the native Danish and the immigrant groups in order to study the pattern of association between items for the two groups.

With the purpose of investigating the *outcomes* of transformational leadership across time, we performed a general linear model controlled for age and gender. We analysed two models: a Model 1 (without control for baseline outcomes) and a Model 2 (with control for baseline outcomes). All analyses were performed in IBM Statistics SPSS 20. The study followed the guidelines of and was approved by The Danish Data Protection Agency.

## RESULTS

Table 1 displays the intercorrelations, means, and standard deviations for the independent, dependent, and control variables of the study population. The results show significant correlations between transformational leadership, job satisfaction, self-rated health, and well-being.

### Perceptions of transformational leadership

Concerning the perceptions of transformational leadership, the independent sample *T*-test reveals no significant difference between the native Danish and the immigrant group in the reported mean level of transformational leadership as a general construct. In addition, a nonsignificant difference is found for each of the seven transformational leadership items (see Table 2). Furthermore, the native Danish group reports significantly better self-rated health and well-being than the immigrant group, while there is no significant difference in the reported mean level of job satisfaction.

The principal component analysis (see Table 3) demonstrates that all of the seven transformational leadership items load highly (0.81–0.91) on one factor with a Cronbach's  $\alpha$  of 0.95. When performing the analysis for the two groups separately, we find analogous factor structures and loadings. The native Danish group has loadings from 0.81 to 0.91 with a Cronbach's  $\alpha$  of 0.95, while the immigrant group has loadings from 0.81 to 0.90 with a Cronbach's  $\alpha$  of 0.94. Table 4 displays the intercorrelations for the seven transformational leadership items for native Danes and immigrants separately. We find that item correlations are similar for the two groups. Hence, we find no evidence that native and immigrant employees differ in their perception of transformational leadership. Overall, Hypothesis 1 was thus not supported by our results.

### Outcomes of transformational leadership

Relevant to the outcomes of transformational leadership, the analyses in Model 1 show for native Danes positive, significant relations between T1 transformational leadership and T2 job satisfaction,

TABLE 1. INTERCORRELATIONS, MEANS AND SD

Respondents	1	2	3	4	5	6	M	SD
1. Transformational leadership	1	–	–	–	–	–	60.35	20.88
2. Well-being	0.18**	1	–	–	–	–	66.36	17.25
3. Health	0.10**	0.48**	1	–	–	–	56.95	21.84
4. Job satisfaction	0.17**	0.30**	0.15**	1	–	–	63.81	18.54
5. Age	–0.02	0.07**	–0.12**	0.03*	1	–	47.83	7.97
6. Years of employment	–0.00	0.08**	–0.02	0.07**	0.35**	1	10.63	8.10

Note.  $n = 2,562$ – $2,924$ .

\* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$ .



**TABLE 2. INDEPENDENT SAMPLES TEST FOR NATIVE DANES AND IMMIGRANTS**

	Group		t	Confidence interval (95%)	
	Native Danes	Immigrants		Lower	Upper
Transformational leadership	60.32 (20.82)	61.19 (22.26)	-0.43	-4.87	3.12
1. Vision	66.41 (22.72)	65.51 (23.36)	0.40	-3.48	5.28
2. Staff development	59.11 (22.22)	59.49 (25.05)	-0.18	-4.68	3.91
3. Supportive leadership	59.08 (24.20)	59.17 (26.50)	-0.04	-4.74	4.56
4. Empowerment	58.83 (24.60)	60.42 (26.10)	-0.66	-6.33	3.15
5. Innovative thinking	62.19 (23.14)	63.07 (24.20)	-0.39	-5.32	3.55
6. Lead by example	58.14 (25.07)	58.26 (27.23)	-0.05	-4.93	4.70
7. Charismatic leadership	58.54 (25.71)	61.81 (27.65)	-1.29	-8.23	1.69
Well-being	66.57 (17.13)	61.18 (19.49)	2.84**	1.64	9.14
Health	57.20 (21.82)	50.46 (21.51)	3.21**	2.58	10.01
Job satisfaction	63.89 (18.49)	61.48 (19.55)	1.27	-1.33	6.15

Note. SD appear in parentheses beside means.

\*\* $p < .01$ .

**TABLE 3. COMPONENT MATRIX**

	All loading	$\alpha$	Danes loading	$\alpha$	Immigrants loading	$\alpha$
Transformational leadership		0.95		0.95		0.94
1. Vision	0.83		0.83		0.84	
2. Staff development	0.81		0.81		0.81	
3. Supportive leadership	0.85		0.84		0.90	
4. Empowerment	0.91		0.91		0.90	
5. Innovative thinking	0.87		0.87		0.84	
6. Lead by example	0.91		0.91		0.89	
7. Charismatic leadership	0.90		0.91		0.87	

Note.  $n = 2,836$ /Danes and 111/immigrants. Varimax rotation.

**TABLE 4. INTERCORRELATIONS, MEANS AND SD FOR SCORES ON THE SEVEN TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP ITEMS FOR DANES AND IMMIGRANTS**

Items	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	M	SD
1. Vision	1	0.76**	0.70**	0.71**	0.61**	0.67**	0.64**	65.51	23.36
2. Staff development	0.69**	1	0.66**	0.62**	0.60**	0.68**	0.65**	59.49	25.05
3. Supportive leadership	0.61**	0.61**	1	0.82**	0.71**	0.78**	0.74**	59.17	26.50
4. Empowerment	0.73**	0.67**	0.76**	1	0.75**	0.77**	0.75**	60.42	26.06
5. Innovative thinking	0.66**	0.63**	0.71**	0.78**	1	0.69**	0.70**	63.07	24.20
6. Lead by example	0.69**	0.68**	0.72**	0.79**	0.75**	1	0.78**	58.26	27.23
7. Charismatic leadership	0.70**	0.67**	0.71**	0.81**	0.75**	0.85**	1	61.81	27.65
M	66.41	59.11	59.08	58.83	62.19	58.14	58.54		
SD	22.72	22.22	24.20	24.60	23.14	25.07	25.71		

Note. Intercorrelations between transformational leadership items for Danes ( $n = 2,746-2,782$ ) presented below the diagonal and immigrants ( $n = 107-109$ ) presented above the diagonal.

\*\* $p < .01$ .

TABLE 5. GENERAL LINEAR MODEL: DANES

Dependent variables	Source	Model 1				Model 2			
		<i>n</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>B</i>
Well-being		2,731				2,702			
	Age		15.34	0.00	0.16		2.83	0.09	0.06
	Gender		0.02	0.88	0.31		0.04	0.85	-0.35
	Transformational leadership		84.83	0.00	0.14		5.03	0.03	0.03
	Well-being (baseline)		-	-	-		735.41	0.00	0.51
Health		2,755				2,740			
	Age		36.30	0.00	-0.31		9.02	0.00	-0.13
	Gender		0.17	0.68	1.10		1.66	0.20	2.81
	Transformational leadership		28.85	0.00	0.11		1.38	0.24	0.02
	Health (baseline)		-	-	-		1,233.98	0.00	0.58
Job satisfaction		2,718				2,435			
	Age		6.49	0.01	-0.00		4.40	0.04	0.09
	Gender		0.97	0.33	-0.06		1.34	0.25	2.56
	Transformational leadership		79.45	0.00	-0.00		12.55	0.00	0.06
	Job satisfaction (baseline)		-	-	-		798.29	0.00	0.51

self-rated health, and well-being. In Model 2 (with baseline control), the relations of T1 transformational leadership with T2 job satisfaction and well-being maintain their significance, while the relation with self-rated health ceases to be significant (see Table 5). For immigrants, Model 1 demonstrates that T1 transformational leadership has a positive, significant relation with T2 well-being, and a trend towards a positive, significant relation with T2 job satisfaction. The model also shows a nonsignificant relation with T2 self-rated health. In Model 2 (with baseline control), all relations cease to be significant (Table 6).

At item level, some items contribute more than others to the three outcomes in the native Danish group (see Table 7). While all seven transformational leadership items relate significantly to job satisfaction, only the items of vision, staff development, and empowerment relate significantly to well-being. Despite the overall nonsignificant relation between transformational leadership and self-rated health, the one item of vision relates significantly to the self-rated health of Danish employees. For the immigrant group, none of the items relate significantly to the three outcomes. For these reasons, our results offer overall support to Hypothesis 2 suggesting that transformational leadership affects individual outcomes differently for employees with native Danish and immigrant backgrounds.

## DISCUSSION

Challenging the assumption that transformational leadership is perceived and works similarly across cultures and nationalities, we set out to perform a within-country test of the assumption of universalistic transformational leadership.

### Leadership universality or not?

We found no difference in the *perception* of transformational leadership between native Danish and immigrant respondents – neither in reported mean level, in pattern and magnitude of item loadings, nor in pattern of association by item intercorrelations. While these findings correspond with some current research suggesting a trend towards cultural convergence in employees' perception of successful

**TABLE 6. GENERAL LINEAR MODEL: IMMIGRANTS**

Dependent variables	Sources	Model 1				Model 2			
		n	F	p	B	n	F	p	B
Well-being		107				106			
	Age		2.17	0.14	0.36		0.81	0.37	0.21
	Gender		-14	0.71	-2.69		0.05	0.82	-1.54
	Transformational leadership		9.03	0.00	0.26		1.44	0.23	0.10
	Well-being (baseline)		-	-	-		20.51	0.00	0.49
Health		107				106			
	Age		2.91	0.09	-0.46		2.20	0.14	-0.34
	Gender		2.68	0.11	-13.22		2.16	0.15	-10.13
	Transformational leadership		0.71	0.40	0.08		0.55	0.46	0.06
	Health (baseline)		-	-	-		30.79	0.00	0.54
Job satisfaction		108				106			
	Age		0.35	0.56	0.00		1.39	0.24	0.25
	Gender		0.27	0.61	-0.09		0.09	0.77	1.85
	Transformational leadership		7.34	0.01	-0.01		0.32	0.57	0.04
	Job satisfaction (baseline)		-	-	-		50.50	0.00	0.60

**TABLE 7. THE SEVEN TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP ITEM LOADINGS ON THREE OUTCOMES: DANES AND IMMIGRANTS**

Dependent variables	Danes		Immigrants	
	p	B	p	B
<b>Well-being</b>				
Item 1 – vision	0.00	0.04	0.28	0.09
Item 2 – staff development	0.00	0.04	0.42	0.06
Item 3 – supportive leadership	0.12	0.02	0.13	0.10
Item 4 – empowerment	0.05	0.02	0.61	0.04
Item 5 – innovative thinking	0.23	0.02	0.70	0.03
Item 6 – lead by example	0.12	0.02	0.16	0.10
Item 7 – charismatic leadership	0.06	0.02	0.23	0.08
<b>Health</b>				
Item 1 – vision	0.00	0.05	0.28	0.09
Item 2 – staff development	0.12	0.02	0.73	0.03
Item 3 – supportive leadership	0.45	-0.01	0.50	0.05
Item 4 – empowerment	0.59	0.01	0.66	0.03
Item 5 – innovative thinking	0.95	-0.00	0.99	0.00
Item 6 – lead by example	0.12	0.02	0.27	0.07
Item 7 – charismatic leadership	0.32	0.01	0.58	0.04
<b>Job satisfaction</b>				
Item 1 – vision	0.01	0.04	0.76	0.02
Item 2 – staff development	0.00	0.04	0.13	0.10
Item 3 – supportive leadership	0.00	0.04	0.46	0.05
Item 4 – empowerment	0.00	0.05	0.36	-0.06
Item 5 – innovative thinking	0.01	0.04	0.97	-0.00
Item 6 – lead by example	0.00	0.05	0.46	0.05
Item 7 – charismatic leadership	0.00	0.04	0.24	0.07

managers (Lankau & Chung, 2009), they do not support the contingency proposition that cultural differences determine different perception processes of leadership (Yan & Hunt, 2005). Although our findings could indeed be interpreted to lend support to the universality theory of transformational leadership, the fact that we find similar perceptions across native and immigrant groups could reflect an assimilation process rather than transformational leadership universality. According to the Merriam-Webster Dictionary, the word assimilation means: 'To adopt the ways of another culture: to fully become part of a different society, country, etc.' (<http://www.merriam-webster.com/>). The average current workplace seniority of the immigrants in our sample is 7 years, suggesting that there is indeed a probability that such an assimilation mechanism could have influenced the leadership perception of the participating immigrant group. At first glance, our findings relative to the perception of transformational leadership do therefore not offer an unequivocal answer to the question of universality.

When shifting focus to *outcomes*, our results cease to suggest any support for the universality of transformational leadership. In Model 1 (without baseline control), we find analogous patterns of association across the two employee groups with regard to job satisfaction and well-being. In Model 2 (with baseline control thus referring to the change in outcomes from baseline to follow-up), the differences between employee groups increase. For native Danes, transformational leadership remains a significant predictor of change in job satisfaction and well-being, but not in self-rated health. For immigrants, transformational leadership predicts change in none of the three outcomes. Therefore, transformational leadership seems more important for the development of job satisfaction and well-being of Danish employees than of their immigrant counterparts. The seven transformational leadership items' impact on outcomes also differs between the native Danish and immigrant groups, which leads to questioning the universality of transformational leadership, also at component level. Our findings add to a more general picture suggesting that native and immigrant employee groups do experience different effects of leadership. A Swedish study found, for example, that dissatisfaction with current work and management was related to stress and turn-over intentions for natives, but not for immigrants (Rosmond, Lapidus, & Björntorp, 1996).

These are important findings, suggesting that while the perception of transformational leadership is convergent for native Danes and immigrants, the outcomes of transformational leadership are not. The differentiated outcome relation of transformational leadership across the two employee groups suggests that, despite potential assimilation effects and possible convergence trends towards Western leadership concepts, transformational leadership effects are not universal.

### Leadership and health

Tapping into the specific question of leadership and health, we found that transformational leadership was not related to change in employee self-rated health status in either of our groups. We offer three perspectives to this finding. First, we applied a measure of general self-rated health – not aiming specifically at either physiological or psychological health aspects. Kuoppala et al. (2008) suggest that leadership practises may be more directly related to psychological health symptoms than to physiological. Whether transformational leadership relates differently to different aspects of health – and whether this holds true universally still remains unanswered. Second, the data collection time-lag of our study was 2 years. In the context of the job well-being pyramid (Kuoppala et al., 2008), the path from leadership to health goes through various intermediate outcomes. For such transitions to have a significant bearing on health may require an even longer time lapse. Theorell, Nyberg, Bernin, Oxenstierna, Romanowska, and Westerlund (2010) applied for example a mean time lapse of 9.7 years, finding an association between leadership and ischaemic heart disease. Third, the nonsignificant relation between transformational leadership and self-rated health for immigrants may relate to the generally lower immigrant health status. Exceptional life circumstances both before and after

immigration may have contributed to their poorer health status, which therefore remains unrelated to transformational leadership. The exact explanatory mechanisms of this relation remain a question for future research to address.

Based on our findings, there is a need for understanding how to develop efficient leadership skills, which positively affect the job satisfaction, well-being, and self-rated health of *both* natives and immigrants. This need becomes even more pertinent as our study reveals a situation of worse self-rated health and well-being for the immigrant employee group. Lower self-rated health of immigrant employees has formerly been demonstrated in both quantitative (Borrell & Dallo, 2008) and qualitative studies (Ortega, Carneiro, & Flyvholm, 2010).

### Limitations

In the interpretation of our findings, five main limitations must be taken into account. First, despite our relatively large sample size, the number of immigrants was not large enough to uncover potential within-group variance, which would have been possible with a larger immigrant sample size. Given that sample size affects the calculation of statistical significance, the relatively small sample size of the immigrant group could further have led to nonsignificant results. However, while small  $n$  is a precondition for any subgroup study and significant immigrant results were indeed identified prior to inclusion of baseline measurements, the impact of a small immigrant  $n$  on our study seems minor. Despite the smaller immigrant sample size, the composite nature of the immigrant group may have increased the generalizability of our findings. Second, as the immigrant sample had an average of 7 years of employment in their current workplace, the degree of assimilation may have been relatively high. Further, due to the categorization of employees, the native group may consist of some employees with one non-Danish parent. This situation may to some degree have influenced the responses given by a part of the native Danish employee group. While this categorization may be seen as a limitation to our study, it contrarily also suggests that the effects, we do find, are strong indicators of important between-group variance. Third, our survey was administered in Danish, wherefore our two participant groups did not have the same preconditions for responding. While the application of one questionnaire version ensures measurement equivalence, survey response patterns may differ slightly across languages for bilingual respondents (Marin, Triandis, Betancourt, & Kashima, 1983). The length of service of our immigrant group suggests, however, that the overall language skills would be in a condition to respond both meaningfully and purposefully to the Danish language questionnaire. Fourth, the female domination of the elder care sector should be taken into account when generalizing results to other sectors with different gender distributions. While gender differences in transformational leadership have mostly been studied with regard to the gender of the manager (Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & Van Engen, 2003), there is some indication that both male and female employees are more satisfied with transformational than with transactional leadership (Druskat, 1994). Despite the inherent limitation of the gender distribution of the sample, the similarity of gender preference for leadership style supports the generalizability of our findings. Fifth, the sample covers different educational levels (the time length of training programmes ranging from 7 weeks to 42 months). These differences in educational levels also represent differences in employee roles and responsibilities, which could influence the perception of leadership. However, as the distribution of educational level is similar for the Danish and immigrant respondents and the Danish culture is characterized by a very low power distance, any impact due to educational level is considered minor.

### CONCLUSION

The universalistic paradigm holds the potential of simplifying the phenomenon of leadership in three ways: First, it implies that the same criteria may be applied to selecting people for positions of

leadership in different contexts. Second, it implies that the same leadership training and development programmes may be given to leaders in different contexts. Third, it implies that leadership can be relatively easily transferred from one context to another (Shamir, 2012). Transformational leadership theory is a theory of general principles that only marginally attends to situational factors, as emphasized by Shamir (2012). Newer theories such as authentic leadership theory (see e.g., Gardner, Avolio, Luthans, May, & Walumbwa, 2005) seem to follow the same path, as do popular leadership models which have been written primarily for practitioners (Collins, 2006; Bennis, 2009; Kouzes & Posner, 2012). Although these approaches suggest that certain leadership principles apply across contexts, there are also indications that leadership can take different forms and that relations among leadership variables and outcomes are likely to vary from one situation/context to another (Shamir, 2012; Klimoski, 2013). Frequent calls for integrating context in leadership research have indeed been made (see e.g., Shamir & Howell, 1999; Boal & Hooijberg, 2001; Osborn, Hunt, & Jauch, 2002).

The key findings of our study reveal that – in our study sample – there is no difference between native and immigrant employees' perception of transformational leadership. We found no significant difference between the native Danish and the immigrant respondents in the reported mean level neither for the general construct, nor for the seven individual indicators. Item correlations, factor structure, and item loadings were analogous across groups. With regard to the outcomes of transformational leadership, we did find differences between the native Danish and immigrant employee groups. When controlled for baseline levels, transformational leadership predicted job satisfaction and well-being in the native group – but not in the immigrant group. Hence, these findings suggest that even when perceptions of leadership may be similar across national and immigrant employee groups (be that ascribed to universality or assimilation); national backgrounds do matter for employee-related outcomes of leadership, which therefore lends little support to the universalistic theory of transformational leadership.

Suggesting that national background matters for employee-related outcomes of leadership even within a shared national employment context, our study supports the importance of taking context into consideration when it comes to understanding organizational behaviour (Härtel & O'Connor, 2014) and leadership (Klimoski, 2013). With the purpose of bringing both leadership research and practise forward, we suggest that *leadership research* orients itself away from the implicit absoluteness within both the universalistic and contingent paradigms. Instead, we should dedicate ourselves to defining and testing boundary conditions for leadership – across contexts (nations, cultures, employment relations, companies, sectors), individuals (preferences, characteristics, expectations, cognitions, and emotions), and implementation (situations, processes, interactions). We thereby argue for a combination of paradigms, proposing that leadership styles may hold universal potential – yet at the same time entail constraints concerning contexts, individuals, and implementation. Our study illustrates such a combination, finding on the one hand a culturally convergent or even (simple) universal perceptions of transformational leadership, while on the other hand demonstrating that transformational leadership does not work as a (functional or variform functional) universal agent for developing job satisfaction and well-being across employee groups. Keeping our study limitations in mind, the differences we find within a shared Danish workplace context do, however, increase the certainty with which we can identify them as related to the contextual elements of national and cultural backgrounds. Some of the opportunities for further research arising from our study suggest studies with larger immigrant group samples, and samples with more variation regarding types of professions and employee roles and responsibilities. Future research could also benefit from investigating the perception and effects of a variety of leadership behaviours.

Suggesting that positive developments in job satisfaction and well-being may hold aspects of both leadership universality and contingency, our findings also become relevant to *management practise*. In a globalized world where composite employee groups are becoming the rule rather than the exception,



applying universal leadership principles with a contingency practise may be an appropriate approach for leaders who wish to exert cultural sensitivity and managerial actions reflecting global leadership skills. The demand for adaptability and flexibility in rapidly changing workplaces adds to the complexity of the questions of perception and impact of leadership. Nonetheless, more knowledge on which, how, why, and when a variety of leadership behaviours (beyond transformational leadership) work in nationally and culturally composite contexts is needed to support the development of leadership skills that are effective in complex organizations employing both native and immigrant groups.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The study was supported by a grant from the Danish government (SATS 2004) administered by the Ministry of Employment.

## References

- Antonakis, J. (2012). Transformational and charismatic leadership. In D. V. Day, & J. Antonakis (Eds.), *The nature of leadership* (2nd ed., pp. 256–288). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.
- Antonakis, J., Avolio, B. J., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (2003). Context and leadership: An examination of the nine-factor full-range leadership theory using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14(3), 261–295.
- Ardichvili, A., & Gasparishvili, A. (2001). Leadership profiles of managers in post-communist countries: A comparative study. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 22(2), 62–69.
- Arnold, K., Turner, N., Barling, J., Kelloway, E., & Mckee, M. C. (2007). Transformational leadership and psychological well-being: The mediating role of meaningful work. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 12(3), 193–203.
- Avery, D., Tonidandel, S., Volpone, S., & Raghuram, A. (2010). Overworked in America? How work hours, immigrant status, and interpersonal justice affect perceived work overload. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 25(2), 133–147.
- Avolio, B. J., Reichard, R. J., Hannah, S. T., Walumbwa, F. O., & Chan, A. (2009). A meta-analytic review of leadership impact research: Experimental and quasi-experimental studies. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20(5), 764–784.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: The Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1997). Does the transactional–transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries? *American Psychologist*, 52(2), 130–139.
- Bass, B. M. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8(1), 9–32.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1989). Potential biases in leadership measures: How prototypes, leniency, and general satisfaction relate to ratings and rankings of transformational and transactional leadership constructs. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 49(3), 509–527.
- Bass, B. M., & Bass, R. (2009). *The Bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications*. New York, NJ: Free Press.
- Bech, P., Olsen, L. R., Kjoller, M., & Rasmussen, N. K. (2003). Measuring well-being rather than the absence of distress symptoms: A comparison of the SF-36 Mental Health Subscale and the WHO-Five Well-Being Scale. *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research*, 12(2), 85–91.
- Bennis, W. G. (2009). *On becoming a leader*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bjorner, J. B., Fayes, P., & Idler, E. (2005). Self-rated health. In: P. Fayes & R. Hays (Eds.), *Assessing quality of life in clinical trials* (2nd ed.) (pp. 309–323). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Boal, K. B., & Hooijberg, R. (2001). Strategic leadership research: Moving on. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 11(4), 515–549.
- Borrell, L. N., & Dallo, F. J. (2008). Self-rated health and race among Hispanic and non-Hispanic adults. *Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health*, 10(3), 229–238.
- Braun, S., Peus, C., Weisweiler, S., & Frey, D. (2013). Transformational leadership, job satisfaction, and team performance: A multilevel mediation model of trust. *Leadership Quarterly*, 24(1), 270–283.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.

- Carless, S. A., Wearing, A. J., & Mann, L. (2000). A short measure of transformational leadership. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 14*(3), 389–405.
- Collins, J. (2006). Level 5 leadership: The triumph of humility and fierce resolve. In D. Mayle (Ed.), *Managing Innovation and Change* (3rd ed., pp. 234–248). London: Sage.
- Conger, J., Kanungo, R. N., & Menon, S. (2000). Charismatic leadership and follower effects. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21*(7), 747–767.
- Day, D. V., & Antonakis, J. (2012). Leadership: Past, present, and future. In D. V. Day, & J. Antonakis (Eds.), *The nature of leadership* (2nd ed., pp. 3–25). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Day, D. V., & Antonakis, J. (2013). The future of leadership. In H. S. Leonard, R. Lewis, A. M. Freedman, & J. Passmore (Eds.), *The Wiley-Blackwell handbook of the psychology of leadership, change and organizational development* (pp. 221–236). Oxford: John Wiley & Sons.
- Den Hartog, D., House, R., Hanges, P., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S., & Dorfman, P. (1999). Culture specific and cross-culturally generalizable implicit leadership theories: Are attributes of charismatic/transformational leadership universally endorsed? *The Leadership Quarterly, 10*(2), 219–256.
- DeSalvo, K. B., Fan, V. S., McDonell, M. B., & Fihn, S. D. (2005). Predicting mortality and healthcare utilization with a single question. *Health Services Research, 40*(4), 1234–1246.
- Dickson, M., Castaño, N., Magomaeva, A., & Den Hartog, D. (2012). Conceptualizing leadership across cultures. *Journal of World Business, 47*(4), 483–492.
- Dinh, J. E., Lord, R. G., Gardner, W. L., Meuser, J. D., Liden, R. C., & Hu, J. (2014). Leadership theory and research in the new millennium: Current theoretical trends and changing perspectives. *The Leadership Quarterly, 25*(1), 36–62.
- Druskat, V. U. (1994). Gender and leadership style: Transformational and transactional leadership in the Roman Catholic Church. *The Leadership Quarterly, 5*(2), 99–119.
- Eagly, A. H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C., & Van Engen, M. L. (2003). Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing women and men. *Psychological Bulletin, 129*(4), 569–591.
- Engelen, A., Schmidt, S., Strenger, L., & Brettel, M. (2014). Top management's transformational leader behaviors and innovation orientation: A cross-cultural perspective in eight countries. *Journal of International Management, 20*(2), 124–136.
- Ergeneli, A., Gohar, R., & Temirbekova, Z. (2007). Transformational leadership: Its relationship to culture value dimensions. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 31*(6), 703–724.
- Fiedler, F. E. (1986). The contribution of cognitive resources and leader behavior to organizational performance. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 16*(6), 532–548.
- Gardner, W. L., Avolio, B. J., Luthans, F., May, D. R., & Walumbwa, F. (2005). 'Can you see the real me?' A self-based model of authentic leader and follower development. *The Leadership Quarterly, 16*(3), 343–372.
- Gerstner, C. R., & Day, D. V. (1994). Cross-cultural comparison of leadership prototypes. *The Leadership Quarterly, 5*(2), 121–134.
- Hamlin, R. G. (2007). In support of universalistic models of managerial and leadership effectiveness: Implications for HRD research and practice. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 15*(2), 189–215.
- Hanges, P., Lord, R., & Dickson, M. (2000). An information-processing perspective on leadership and culture: A case for connectionist architecture. *Applied Psychology, 49*(1), 133–161.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1969). An introduction to situational leadership. *Training and Development Journal, 23*, 26–34.
- Hofstede, G. (1984). Cultural dimensions in management and planning. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management, 1*(2), 81–99.
- Hosoda, M., & Stone-Romero, E. (2010). The effects of foreign accents on employment-related decisions. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 25*(2), 113–132.
- House, R., Javidan, M., Hanges, P., & Dorfman, P. (2002). Understanding cultures and implicit leadership theories across the globe: An introduction to project GLOBE. *Journal of World Business, 37*(1), 3–10.
- Härel, C. E., & O'Connor, J. M. (2014). Contextualizing research: Putting context back into organizational behavior research. *Journal of Management & Organization, 20*(4), 417–422.
- Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., de Luque, M. S., & House, R. J. (2006). In the eye of the beholder: Cross cultural lessons in leadership from project GLOBE. *The Academy of Management Perspectives, 20*(1), 67–90.
- Jepson, D. (2009). Studying leadership at cross-country level: A critical analysis. *Leadership, 5*(1), 61–80.
- Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(5), 755–768.

- Jung, D., Yammarino, F. J., & Lee, J. K. (2009). Moderating role of subordinates' attitudes on transformational leadership and effectiveness: A multi-cultural and multi-level perspective. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20(4), 586–603.
- Jung, D. I., & Avolio, B. J. (1999). Effects of leadership style and followers' cultural orientation on performance in group and individual task conditions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42(2), 208–218.
- Jung, D. I., Bass, B. M., & Sosik, J. J. (1995). Bridging leadership and culture: A theoretical consideration of transformational leadership and collectivistic cultures. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 2(4), 3–18.
- Jung, D. I., & Yammarino, F. J. (2001). Perceptions of transformational leadership among Asian Americans and Caucasian Americans: A level of analysis perspective. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 8(1), 3–21.
- Karakitapoglu-Aygun, Z., & Gumusluoglu, L. (2013). The bright and dark sides of leadership: Transformational vs. non-transformational leadership in a non-Western context. *Leadership*, 9(1), 107–133.
- Klimoski, R. (2013). Commentary: When it comes to leadership, context matters. In M. G. Rumsey (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of leadership* (pp. 267–287). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (2012). *The leadership challenge: How to make extraordinary things happen*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kumar, R., & Chhokar, J. S. (2012). Cross-cultural leadership. In M. G. Rumsey (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Leadership* (pp. 225–242). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Kuoppala, J., Lamminpää, A., Liira, J., & Vainio, H. (2008). Leadership, job well-being, and health effects – a systematic review and a meta-analysis. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 50(8), 904–915.
- Lankau, M. J., & Chung, B. G. (2009). A comparison of American and international prototypes of successful managers. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 3(1), 7–18.
- Leong, L. Y. C., & Fischer, R. (2011). Is transformational leadership universal? A meta-analytical investigation of multifactor leadership questionnaire means across cultures. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 18(2), 164–174.
- Lonner, W. J. (1980). The search for psychological universals. In H. C. Triandis & W. W. Lambert (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 143–204). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Lowe, K. B., Kroeck, K. G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 7(3), 385–425.
- Marin, G., Triandis, H. C., Betancourt, H., & Kashima, Y. (1983). Ethnic affirmation versus social desirability explaining discrepancies in bilinguals' responses to a questionnaire. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 14(2), 173–186.
- Miao, Q., Newman, A., & Lamb, P. (2012). Transformational leadership and the work outcomes of Chinese migrant workers: The mediating effects of identification with leader. *Leadership*, 8(4), 377–395.
- Muczyk, J. P., & Holt, D. T. (2008). Toward a cultural contingency model of leadership. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 14(4), 277–286.
- Nyberg, A., Bernin, P., & Theorell, T. (2005). *The impact of leadership on the health of subordinates*. Stockholm: National Institute for Working Life (Arbetslivsinstitutet).
- Olesen, K., Carneiro, I. G., Jørgensen, M. B., Rugulies, R., Rasmussen, C. D., Søgaard, K., & Flyvholm, M.-A. (2012). Associations between psychosocial work environment and hypertension among non-Western immigrant and Danish cleaners. *International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health*, 85(7), 829–835.
- Ortega, A., Carneiro, I. G., & Flyvholm, M.-A. (2010). A descriptive study on immigrant workers in the elderly care sector. *Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health*, 12(5), 699–706.
- Osborn, R. N., Hunt, J. G., & Jauch, L. R. (2002). Toward a contextual theory of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13(6), 797–837.
- Popper, M., & Druyan, N. (2001). Cultural prototypes? Or leaders' behaviors? A study on workers' perceptions of leadership in an electronics industry. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 16(7), 549–558.
- Rosmond, R., Lapidus, L., & Björntorp, P. (1996). A comparative review of psychosocial and occupational environment in native Swedes and immigrants. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health*, 24(4), 237–242.
- Shamir, B. (2012). *Leadership in context and context in leadership studies*. In M. G. Rumsey (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Leadership* (pp. 343–355). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Shamir, B., House, R., & Arthur, M. B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership – A self-concept based theory. *Organization Science*, 4(4), 577–594.
- Shamir, B., & Howell, J. M. (1999). Organizational and contextual influences on the emergence and effectiveness of charismatic leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), 257–283.

- Shelton, E. J. (2007). *Transformational leadership: Its impact on Hispanic immigrant workers in a production/processing plant environment*. PhD dissertation, Capella University.
- Soares, A. M., Farhangmehr, M., & Shoham, A. (2007). Hofstede's dimensions of culture in international marketing studies. *Journal of Business Research*, 60(3), 277–284.
- Steers, R. M., Sanchez-Runde, C., & Nardon, L. (2012). Leadership in a global context: New directions in research and theory development. *Journal of World Business*, 47(4), 479–482.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1974). *Handbook of leadership. A survey of the literature*. New York: Free Press.
- Terrell, S. R., & Rosenbusch, K. (2013). How global leaders develop. *Journal of Management Development*, 32(10), 1056–1079.
- Theorell, T., Nyberg, A., Bernin, P., Oxenstierna, G., Romanowska, J., & Westerlund, H. (2010). Leadership and employee health: A challenge in the contemporary workplace. In J. Houdmont, & S. Leka (Eds.), *Contemporary occupational health psychology: Global perspectives on research and practice* (Vol. 1, pp. 46–58). Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Topp, C. W., Østergaard, S. D., Søndergaard, S., & Bech, P. (2015). The WHO-5 Well-Being Index: A systematic review of the literature. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics*, 84(3), 167–176.
- Van Knippenberg, D., & Sitkin, S. B. (2013). A critical assessment of charismatic – Transformational leadership research: Back to the drawing board? *The Academy of Management Annals*, 7(1), 1–60.
- Vroom, V. H., & Jago, A. G. (2007). The role of the situation in leadership. *American Psychologist*, 62(1), 17–24.
- Walumbwa, F. O., & Lawler, J. J. (2003). Building effective organizations: Transformational leadership, collectivist orientation, work-related attitudes and withdrawal behaviours in three emerging economies. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 14(7), 1083–1101.
- Walumbwa, F. O., Lawler, J. L., & Avolio, B. J. (2007). Leadership, individual differences, and work-related attitudes: A cross-culture investigation. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 56(2), 212–230.
- Walumbwa, F. O., Orwa, B., Wang, P., & Lawler, J. J. (2007). Transformational leadership, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction: A comparative study of Kenyan and U.S. financial firms. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 16(2), 235–256.
- Walumbwa, F. O., & Wernsing, T. (2012). From transactional and transformational leadership to authentic leadership. In M. G. Rumsey (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Leadership* (pp. 392–400). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Wanasika, I., Howell, J.P., Littrell, R., & Dorfman, P. (2011). Managerial leadership and culture in sub-Saharan Africa. *Journal of World Business*, 46(2), 234–241.
- Wright, T. A., & Staw, B. M. (1999). Affect and favorable work outcomes: Two longitudinal tests of the happy-productive worker thesis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20(1), 1–23.
- Yan, J., & Hunt, J. G. J. (2005). A cross cultural perspective on perceived leadership effectiveness. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 5(1), 49–66.
- Yukl, G. (2002). *Leadership in organizations* (5th ed.), Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.