Maritime Managers of the Future – What do They Think is Good Leadership?

B.A.B. Fjærli, K.I. Øvergård & T.V. Westerberg
Buskerud and Vestfold University College, Borre, Norway

ABSTRACT: The maritime industry is multinational and multicultural. Understanding which leadership skills that are effective in such environments is necessary to be a successful leader. Work experience in multinational companies will give a different insight into which management practices are seen as desirable for future maritime leaders within a global industry. According to trait theories there are properties that can be trained and some that are linked to personality, which are not easily trainable. Since leadership skills are a combination of both trainable and not so trainable skills, it is necessary to understand what types of skills are seen as endorsed, and not endorsed by the future maritime managers. The present paper shows results from a questionnaire study using the GLOBE Leadership questionnaire where 52 master of maritime management students (i.e. maritime managers of the future) rates 112 different leadership skills according to which degree these skills support outstanding leadership or not. The results show which leadership skills the maritime leaders of the future believe will support outstanding leadership. Contrasts between participant with and without work experience form multinational corporations will be shown – giving an indication of how the perception of leadership is changed through work experience in a multi-cultural context. The result will give an insight in how future management practices should be. Knowledge of the universally endorsed maritime leadership skills can be used as a guideline in the recruitment process for maritime managers.

1 INTRODUCTION

Understanding how future leaders perceive different leadership attributes and dimensions is important, as it is likely to play a role in the future development of organizational behavior. Leadership attributes can be perceived as inhibiting, contributing or having no impact on desired leadership. Leadership can be defined as "*the ability of an individual to influence, motivate, and enable others to contribute towards the effectiveness and success of the organizations of which they are members*" (House, Dorfman, Javidan, Hanges, & Sully de Luque 2013, p. 17). This paper attempts to map out which parts of leadership that are perceived to be positive, neutral or negative to future maritime leaders and managers. Our participants are defined as future maritime leaders because they are currently master students in maritime management, and a number of them will take jobs in the maritime industry where they have to manage personnel and projects.

According to the Culturally Endorsed Implicit Leadership Theory (CLT), cognitive schemas about traits and abilities of the ideal leader are shared among individuals belonging to a common culture (Javidan, Dorfman, Sully de Luque, & House, 2006). Thus, understanding which leadership qualities the future maritime leaders endorse can help us

understanding how leadership may change in the not-so distant future.

This research project has used parts of the GLOBE Phase 2 Alpha questionnaire to measure the desirability or disdain for a variety of leadership attributes. It contains questions about 112 leadership attributes, each attribute being measured with one question/item. These 112 items then are aggregated into 21 primary leadership dimensions. The 21 primary leadership dimensions are then aggregated into six global leadership scales.

Six global leadership scales. A total of 21 primary leadership dimensions form the six culturally endorsed leadership scales (charismatic/value-based, team-oriented, self-protective, participative, humane-oriented and autonomous leadership). They are shortly explicated in the following paragraphs.

Charismatic/Value-Based leadership. A Charismatic/Value-Based leader has the ability to motivate and inspire others, and because of strong core values expects high performance. This scale consist of six of the 21 primary leadership dimensions: Visionary, Inspirational, Self-Sacrifice, Integrity, Decisive, and Performance-oriented (Dorfman, Javidan, Hanges, Dastmalchian, & House, 2012).

Team oriented leadership. This type of leaders facilitates effective team building and instills commitment to goals among the team members (House, Hanges, Ruiz-Quintanilla, Dorfman, Javidan, Dickson, & Gupta, 1999). This scale consists of five of the 21 primary leadership dimensions: Collaborative Team Orientation, Team Integrator, Diplomatic, Malevolent, and Administratively competent)

Self-protective Leadership. This type of leaders are concerned with face-saving and promoting own status to increase safety and security of the individual and group. This scale consists of five of the 21 primary leadership dimensions: Self-centered, Status conscious, Conflict inducer, Face-saver, Procedural (House et al., 2013).

Participative Leadership. Participative leaders involve others in decision-making and implementation (House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta, 2004). This scale consists of two of the 21 primary leadership dimensions: Autocratic and Non-participative.

Humane-Oriented Leadership. Emphasizes being compassionate, generous, supportive and considerate as a leader (ibid). This scale consists of two of the 21 primary leadership dimensions: Modesty and Humane orientation.

Autonomous Leadership. This dimension reflects independent and individualistic leadership attributes (House et al., 1999). This scale consists of one of the 21 primary leadership dimensions and several items: Individualistic, Independent, Autonomous, and Unique.

1.1 Research Questions

This paper attempts to identify which leadership skills that future maritime leaders believe will contribute or inhibit outstanding leadership. Furthermore, the results will indicate if multi national work experience has an implication on the perception on leadership.

2 METHOD

2.1 Participants

The sample consisted of a total of 52 respondents (19 women and 23 men, 10 respondents did not define their gender) fulltime and part-time students of maritime management studies at a major educational institution in Norway. The age range was from 22 to 52 with a mean of 28,5 (SD = 1,3 years). Not all respondents responded to the all questions in the survey, hence there is some variation in the number of respondents for different items and dimensions.

The group of participants where multinational – with a slight overweight of people from Northern Europe. Otherwise the rest of the participants came from all continents except Australia/Oceania. A total of 18 students indicated that they had worked in a multinational company, while 17 indicated that they did not have this experience. There where no statistical relationship between the nationality of the students and their work experience with work in multinational companies as measured by a Chi-square test.

2.2 Questionnaire

The GLOBE Phase 2 Alpha questionnaire (Globe, 2006) was used to measure the future leader´s opinions on which leadership skills that contribute to outstanding leadership. Each leadership skill was measured by a 7-point rating scale where the possible answers where '1 = greatly inhibits', ' 2 = somewhat inhibits', '3 = slightly inhibits', ' 4 = has no impact', '5 = contributes slightly', '6 = contributes somewhat', '7 = contributes greatly'. Each of the respective numbers for each answer was used in data analysis, thus leaving 4 as the neutral option 'has no impact'.

A two sample questions are presented below. The participants were to indicate the degree to which this particular leadership skill inhibited or contributed to outstanding leadership by writing down the number that corresponded closes to their opinion.

Characteristic or Behavior		Definition
____ 2-1 relations,	Diplomatic	= Skilled at interpersonal
		tactful.
____ 2-2 negative	Evasive	= Refrains from making
good		comments to maintain
		relations and save face.

2.3 Re-coding of answers

The answers were re-coded before statistical analysis by subtracting 4 from each score – thereby ensuring that the neutral option was 0 and that the leadership skills that inhibited outstanding leadership skills where negative while skills that contributed to outstanding leadership skills became positive.

3 RESULTS

One-sample *t*-tests tested whether the leadership skills where different from the neutral value 0 (e.g. it tested whether a leadership skill where rated as either inhibiting or contributing to outstanding leadership). Results where accepted as statistically significant if the 95% Confidence Interval (CI) did not include zero (0). Positive means indicate that skills contribute to outstanding leadership and negative means indicate that the skill inhibits outstanding leadership. A detailed overview of the results is presented in table 1. The terms 'Lower' and 'Upper' refers to the lower and upper limits of the 95% Confidence Interval for the mean score of each variable.

Of the six global leadership scales four global leadership scales were evaluated as contributing to outstanding leadership. *Team Oriented Leadership* (Mean = 1.5, 95% CI [1.3, 1.8]) and *Charismatic/Value-based Leadership* (Mean = 1.5, 95% CI [1.28, 1.8] were rated as equally contributing to outstanding leadership. *Participative Leadership* ranked third (Mean = 1.2 95% CI [1, 1.5]) and *Humane Oriented Leadership* (Mean = 1, 95% CI [0.8, 1.2]) ranked last among the positive leadership scales.

The two leadership skills *Self-protective Leadership* (Mean = -0.6, 95% CI [-0.8, -0.4]) and *Autonomous Leadership* (Mean = -0.5, 95% CI [-0.8, -0.2]) were found to inhibit outstanding leadership. A more detailed overview is given in *Table 1*. Table 1 shows the different leadership skills, 'lower' and 'upper' refers to the end points of the 95% confidence interval. A confidence interval that does not contain 0 indicates that the leadership skill is seen as either inhibiting (if the mean is negative) or contributing (if the mean is positive).

Effect of experience in multinational companies. Two-tailed independent samples *t*-tests indicated that, with exception the primary leadership skill *Procedural/Bureaucratic* (belonging to the Self Protective leadership dimension), there were no observable statistical differences (e.g. the 95% CI contains 0) in the perception of leadership skills between those with experience in multinational corporations and those without.

Those with experience from multinational companies (Mean = -0.012, SD = 0.43) rated the leadership skill Procedural/Bureaucratic as less positive than those without experience from multinational companies (Mean = 0.51, SD = 0.56; $t_{(31)}$=-3.049, Mean difference = -0.524, 95% CI of difference [-0.879, -0.174]).

4 DISCUSSION

This questionnaire-based study with a multinational sample of master students of maritime management identified that four global leadership dimension (*Team Oriented Leadership*, *Charismatic/Value-based Leadership*, *Participative Leadership*, *Humane Oriented Leadership*) where seen as contributing to outstanding leadership. Two leadership skills (*Self-protective Leadership* and *Autonomous Leadership*) where rated as inhibiting outstanding leadership. Experience from multinational companies did not make a difference to these findings with the exception of the Procedural/bureaucratic leadership skill where those with experience from multinational companies saw the procedural/bureaucratic skill somewhat more negative than those without international leadership background.

Our findings are in accordance with those of the GLOBE study by finding the same ranking between the six global leadership skills (see e.g. table 4 in Den Hartog et al., 1998), as well as replicating the findings that Autonomous and Self-Protective leadership is seen as inhibiting outstanding leadership.

The global leadership dimension of Charisma/Value-based leadership is closely related to transformational leadership (Bass & Avolio, 1990), which both is argued being a universally endorsed leadership styles (Bass, 1985; Den Hartog, House, Hanges, Ruiz-Quintanilla & Dorfman, 1999). As in the aforementioned findings, future maritime leaders also rate Charisma/Value-based leadership as contributing to outstanding leadership. In the GLOBE- studies (Dorfman et al., 2012) charismatic leadership ranked high to medium in all parts of the world with the Middle East as only exception (Javidan, Dorfman, Luque, House, 2006).

The Team Oriented leadership is on a wordily basis rated medium or medium-high/medium-low, with Latin America as only exception where it was rated high (*ibid*), while in this research project Team Orientation and Charismatic/Value-based leadership was rated the highest of the dimensions. Whether these differences reflect real differences due to characteristics of the maritime industry or whether these are due to other factor remain to be seen.

The lack of differences between those with work experience from multinational companies and those without was surprising – especially because of the observed differences between different cultures when it comes to which leadership skills is seen as good/bad (Den Hartog et al., 1998). It might be that those that are drawn to a maritime career are more globally oriented hence that they appreciate a similar set of leadership skills. It might also be that the joint situation that the students have found themselves during schooling and training at the master program have given them a common view of good leaderships skills. These and other possible answers can be the object for future research projects.

Limitations. Our research has utilized a limited sample of master students or maritime management, hence representing the opinions of future employees and leaders in the maritime industry. Thus we cannot

make claims of the nature of current leadership in the
maritime industry.

Table 1
Leadership Dimensions and Item Scores

Dimensions/Items	N	Mean	Lower	Upper		Dimension/Item	N	Mean	Lower	Upper
Charismatic/Value Based	**42**	**1,5**	**1,28**	**1,8**		Dishonest	43	-2,4	-2,7	-2
Inspirational	42	2	1,67	2,2		Non-cooperative	42	-2,3	-2,6	-2,1
Positive	52	2,1	1,8	2,4		Dependable (reversed)	43	-2	-2,4	-1,7
Encouraging	47	2,1	1,8	2,4		Cynical	43	-2	-2,4	-1,7
Morale booster	47	1,9	1,6	2,3		Intelligent (reversed)	47	-1,9	-2,2	-1,5
Confidence builder	43	1,9	1,5	2,3		Irritable	47	-1,8	-2,2	-1,5
Dynamic	43	1,9	1,5	2,3		Egotistical	42	-1	-1,4	-0,5
Enthusiastic	47	1,9	1,6	2,1		*Administratively Competent*	42	1,7	1,4	2
Motive arouser	43	1,9	1,5	2,3		Administratively skilled	50	1,9	1,5	2,3
Motivational	43	1,7	1,3	2,1		Organized	42	1,7	1,4	2,1
Integrity	43	1,9	1,6	2,1		Good administrator	43	1,7	1,4	2,1
Honest	43	2,1	1,8	2,5		Orderly	47	1,3	1	1,6
Trustworthy	50	2,1	1,7	2,5		**Self-Protective**	**40**	**-0,6**	**-0,8**	**-0,4**
Sincere	50	1,5	1,2	2		*Procedural/Bureaucratic**	42	0,1	-0,1	0,3
Just	50	1,3	0,9	1,7		Procedural	43	1,1	0,7	1,4
Performance Oriented	43	1,7	1,4	2		Formal	47	0,8	0,4	1,2
Improvement-oriented	50	1,8	1,4	2,2		Ritualistic	43	-0,5	-0,9	-0,2
Excellence-oriented	43	1,7	1,4	2		Habitual	43	-0,5	-0,8	-0,2
Performance oriented	43	1,6	1,3	2		*Cautious**	42	-0,3	-0,8	0,1
Visionary	42	1,6	1,3	1,9		*Conflict Inducer**	41	0	-0,3	0,2
Inspirational	50	2,1	1,7	2,5		Normative	42	0,7	0,4	1,1
Plans ahead	42	1,8	1,5	2,1		Intra-Group Competitiveness	51	0,7	0,2	1,1
Prepared	47	1,7	1,4	2		Secretive	47	-1,3	-1,8	-0,9
Intellectually stimulating	47	1,6	1,1	2		*Status Conscious**	41	-0,1	-0,5	0,2
Able to participate	43	1,6	1,2	1,9		Status conscious*	41	0,1	-0,3	0,4
Anticipatory	50	1,5	1,2	1,9		Class conscious*	43	-0,3	-0,8	0,1
Future-oriented	43	1,5	1,1	1,9		*Face-saver*	42	-1,3	-1,6	-1
Foresight	42	1,4	1,1	1,8		Avoids negatives	43	-1,6	-2	-1,2
Visionary	43	1,4	1	1,8		Indirect	43	-1,2	-1,6	-0,8
Decisive	42	1,6	1,3	1,8		Evasive	52	-0,9	-1,5	-0,4
Logical	42	1,7	1,5	2		*Self-centered*	43	-1,7	-2	-1,4
Decisive	47	1,7	1,3	2,1		Self-interested	49	-1,2	-1,7	-0,8
Intuitive	43	1,6	1,3	1,9		Non-participative	43	-1,8	-2,1	-1,5
Willful	43	1,3	0,9	1,7		Loner	47	-1,7	-2	-1,4
Self-Sacrifice	43	0,5	0,2	0,8		Asocial	47	-1,8	-2,2	-1,5
Convincing	43	0,8	0,4	1,2		**Participative**	**41**	**1,2**	**1**	**1,5**
Self-sacrificial	43	0,7	0,2	1,2		*Participative*	41	1,3	1	1,6
Risk taker	50	0	-0,4	0,4		Non-delegator	42	1,9	1,5	2,3
Team Oriented	**41**	**1,5**	**1,3**	**1,8**		Non-egalitarian	43	1,8	1,5	2,2
Collaborative Team Orientation	41	1,3	1	1,5		Micromanager	43	0,8	0,3	1,3
Group-oriented	43	1,7	1,4	2,1		Individually oriented	42	0,8	0,3	1,3
Collaborative	49	1,5	1,2	1,8		*Autocratic (reversed)*	42	1,2	0,9	1,5
Mediator	52	1,5	1,2	1,8		Dictatorial	43	-1,9	-2,3	-1,5
Loyal	49	1,4	1	1,8		Elitist	43	-1,7	-2,1	-1,3
Consultative	47	1,2	0,9	1,5		Autocratic	47	-1,3	-1,7	-0,8
Fraternal*	46	0	-0,4	0,4		Ruler	43	-1	-1,4	-0,6
Team Integrator	42	1,7	1,4	1,9		Domineering	43	-0,7	-1,1	-0,2
Clear	49	2	1,7	2,3		Bossy*	52	-0,4	-0,8	0,1
Informed	42	1,9	1,6	2,3		**Humane Oriented**	**43**	**1**	**0,8**	**1,2**
Team-builder	43	1,9	1,5	2,3		*Modesty*	43	1,1	0,8	1,3
Coordinator	43	1,8	1,4	2,1		Calm	49	1,6	1,2	1,9
Communicative	43	1,8	1,5	2,1		Patient	43	1,4	1	1,8
Subdued	47	1,2	0,8	1,6		Modest	47	1	0,6	1,4
Integrator	49	1,2	0,8	1,6		Self-effacing*	43	0,2	-0,1	0,5
Diplomatic	42	1,1	0,9	1,4		*Humane Oriented*	47	0,9	0,6	1,2
Effective bargainer	42	1,7	1,4	2,1		Compassionate	47	1	0,6	1,4
Diplomatic	52	1,7	1,3	2,1		Generous	47	0,9	0,5	1,2
Win/win problem solver	49	1,6	1,2	2		**Autonomous**	**42**	**-0,5**	**-0,8**	**-0,2**
Worldly	50	0,7	0,3	1,1		*Autonomous*	42	-0,6	-0,9	-0,3
Intra-group conflict avoider	50	-0,7	-1,1	-0,2		Individualistic	43	-1	-1,5	-0,6
Malevolent (reversed)	42	2	1,8	2,2		Autonomous	52	-0,8	-1,3	-0,4
Hostile	43	-2,4	-2,7	-2,1		Independent	52	-0,7	-1,2	-0,2
Vindictive	47	-2,4	-2,7	-2,1		Unique	49	0,3	0	0,7

Note. Core leadership dimension is written in Bold. Primary leadership dimensions are written in italic with its belonging items beneath. * = $p > .05$

5 CONCLUSION

The findings clearly show that the sample of future maritime leaders rated Team Oriented and Charismatic/Value-Based leadership as very positive and contributing to outstanding leadership. Furthermore, the results show that Humane Oriented leadership is positive contributing somewhat to outstanding leadership. And finally that Self-protective leadership and Autonomous leadership are rated as strictly negative and inhibiting for outstanding leadership.

There are almost no differences between those with experience in multinational corporations and those without. However, it still remains to see if there are differences between leadership styles in different countries in the maritime industry, or whether the maritime industry is more affected by the global market situation.

REFERENCES

Bass, B. M. (1985). Leadership and behavior beyond expectations. New York: Free Press.
Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. (1990). The implications of Transactional leadership and Transformational leadership for Individual, Team, and Organizational Development. Research in Organizational Change and Development, 4(1), 231-272.

Dorfman, P., Javidan, M., Hanges, P., Dastmalchian, A., & House, R. (2012). GLOBE: A twenty year journey into the intriguing world of culture and leadership. Journal of World Business, 47(4), 504-518. doi:10.1016/j.jwb.2012.01.0
Den Hartog, D. N., House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., & Ruiz-Quintanilla, S. R. (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.
Globe (2006). GLOBE research survey, form Alpha. The Globe Project. Available at: http://www.thunderbird.edu/wwwfiles/ms/globe/pdf/GLOBE_Phase_2_Alpha_Questionnaire.pdf [last checked February 1st 2015]
House, R. J., Dorfman, P. W., Javidan, M., Hanges, P. J., & Sully de Luque, M. F. (2013). Strategic Leadership Across Cultures: GLOBE Study of CEO Leadership Behavior and Effectiveness in 24 Countries. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage
House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (2004). Culture, Leadership, and Organization. The GLOBE study of 62 societies. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S. A., Dorfman, P. W., Javidan, M., Dickson, M., & Gupta, V. (1999). Cultural influences on leadership and organizations: Project GLOBE. Advances in global leadership, 1, 171-233
Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., Sully de Luque, M., & House, R. J. (2006). In the Eye of the Beholder: Cross Cultural Lessons in Leadership from Project Globe. Academy of Management Perspectives, 20(1), 67-90 doi: 10.5465/AMP.2006.19873410