

# **The role of masculinity in entrepreneurial leadership : A comparative study between Germany and the Netherlands**

Author: Justin Leemkuil  
University of Twente  
P.O. Box 217, 7500AE Enschede  
The Netherlands

**The primary purpose of this study is to find out if there is a difference in entrepreneurial leadership between Germany and the Netherlands and whether this is explainable with the masculinity index. The masculinity index describes the degree to which masculine values are valued over feminine values. Seventy-four companies served as subjects in a study designed to investigate the entrepreneurial difference between Germany and the Netherlands done with five different aspects. On the basis of the results of this research, it can be concluded that the masculinity index is also reflected within the German and Dutch entrepreneurial leaders. This study also reveals that an individual entrepreneurial leader in Germany is less agreeable but more neurotic and open to experience than an entrepreneurial leader in the Netherlands.**

**Supervisors: m.l.ehrenhard**

## **Keywords**

Entrepreneurial leaders, cultural dimensions, masculinity, femininity,

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee.

*1<sup>st</sup>IBA Bachelor Thesis Conference*, November 6<sup>th</sup>, 2014, Enschede, The Netherlands.

Copyright 2014, University of Twente, Faculty of Management and Governance.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

“People in Germany have no sense of humour and always follow the rules and the hierarchy” to shoot from the hip with some German stereotypes. While most Dutch people are coming forward in their behaviour with the stereotypes of being greedy and having a lot of freedom. To a certain extent stereotypes are born from facts. In this case it carries a self-reinforcing effect. Yet whether these stereotypes are true and can also be found in entrepreneurial leadership is still a question. Entrepreneurship is said to be the key to success but does this refer to all the cultures? In this paper we study the difference between Germany and the Netherlands because they have a considerable difference in the masculinity-index.

What kind of entrepreneurial leadership behaviours encourage ownership, risk-taking and growth in employees is a question that needs to be answered. Increasing the amount of information makes it possible to fit leadership in a better way with entrepreneurship. This paper gives an in-depth look on the influence of the masculinity-index on entrepreneurial leadership. The research goal is to find out if there is a difference in entrepreneurial leadership between German and Dutch companies and whether the masculinity has an influence on it. Thus, the research question is formulated as: “Is there a difference in Dutch and German entrepreneurial leadership and is this explainable with the masculinity index?” this question is too large to answer at once. Therefore this question is divided into four sub-questions: 1/ “What are the aspects of entrepreneurial leadership in the Netherlands?”. 2/ “What are the aspects of entrepreneurial leadership in Germany?”. 3/ “What are the differences in entrepreneurial leadership between the Netherlands and Germany?”. 4/ “Can this difference be explained with the masculinity index?” For the academic field, this study will give greater insight in the way leaders should behave to influence their employees, whether this is with masculine leadership or feminine leadership is not yet clear. It could even be the case both have qualified aspects and a synergy is the result. Research into this will eventually ensure benefits for organizational profits made in the long term. Throughout the research a clear structure will be found. In this outline it starts with the given data which will get analysed and interpreted. The next section will include the choices of design and the research methodology. The analysis will form the major points and avails itself of the theory. The last part provides a conclusion which will answer the research question.

## 2. THEORY

To get an answer on our research question and sub-questions, this section will first elaborate on some important concepts on the basis of theories.

### 2.1 Cultural dimensions

**Hofstede (1980)** claims that the values and beliefs held by members of cultures affect the behaviour of individuals, groups and institutions and are identified in cultures to which they are seen as legitimate, acceptable and effective. **Hofstede (1980)** reports culture is “the collective programming of the mind that distinguishes one group or category of people from another.” He splits this in four dimensions of cultural beliefs and values. Individualism vs. Collectivism (IDV), is the degree of how much individuals see themselves independent from social groups and differ from others. Masculinity vs. Femininity (MAS), refers to cultures where the traditional male values are high. Tolerance versus Intolerance of Uncertainty (UAI), is the tolerance for

ambiguity and uncertainty in a society and scores high when the culture is uncomfortable in surprising situations. The Power Distance index (PDI), refers to a society that expect power is unequally distributed. Take for example control mechanisms and strong hierarchies as indicators. Later in his years Hofstede added two more in **Hofstede (2010)**. Pragmatic versus Normative (PRA), refers to how people relate to the fact that so much that happens around us cannot be explained. As last Indulgence versus Restraint (IND), which refers to difference in cultures between relatively free gratification of basic and natural human drives, indulgence, and suppressing gratification of needs and regulates it by means of strict social norms. In this paper the main focus will be on the masculinity-index so further explanation is given.

### 2.2 Masculinity index

The Masculinity-index describes the degree to which masculine values like competitiveness and the acquisition of wealth are valued over feminine values like relationship building and quality of life. The masculine part represents preferences in a society for achievement, heroism, power, assertiveness and material rewards for success. The feminine part represents a preference for cooperation, caring for the weak, modesty. Feminine on the other side also relates to nurturing, versus masculine as assertive and focus on ideals. Despite the name, this cultural dimension has little to do with gender roles, rather it is based on the historical values of the differences between the genders. Like all of Hofstede's ratings, the masculinity-index is believed to be ingrained in the cultural mind set. **Hofstede's (1980)** definition indicates culture is not an individual attribute but collective, it is not directly visible but seen in behaviours and it does not count for the whole population but is common to some. Individuals are to societies as trees are to forests; comparing forests is not comparing trees writ large, to cite **Mead's attribution to Benedict (1934/1959)**

We expect to find a high masculinity in the German entrepreneurs and high femininity within the Dutch entrepreneurs. The reason for this are the already existing values, which are a MAS-index of 66 for Germany and 14 for the Netherlands (**Hofstede et al. 2012**). These values indicate that it is most likely this paper will find more masculine aspects in the German respondents and more feminine aspects in the Dutch respondents. Whether this is true, remains to be seen.

### 2.3 Entrepreneurial leadership

Entrepreneurship, a term with an immense amount of definitions. In the report **Cunningham et al. (1991)** the definition is covered in six different schools of thought. The different schools are divided in “Great Person”, “Psychological Characteristics”, “Classical”, “Management”, “Leadership” and “Intrapreneurship”. These numbers run consecutively and are based on growth in a company from start-up to maturity and all have another central focus or purpose. In this paper, only for one school further explanation is necessary. This report defines the “Leadership School” as if an entrepreneur is a leader of people; they have the ability to adapt their style to the needs of people. With the assumption entrepreneurs cannot accomplish goals alone, but depends on others with their skills of motivating, directing and leading and for this he needs to be a “people manager”. This school will be found in the early growth and maturity. As well, for being an entrepreneurial leader this person needs to be able to define a possible vision and attract people around that vision to transform it into reality (**Kao 1989**). The most penetrating power for this school refers to **Hemphill (1959)**, it is involved how they respond to people's needs and

how they get their tasks accomplished. **McGrath, MacMillan (2000)** stated, the most important job for an entrepreneurial leader is to create an organization that identifies critical competitive insights and finds new opportunities for you as a matter of course. Success is accomplished when everyone in the organization takes for granted that business success is a continual search for new opportunities and a continual letting go of less productive activities. **House et al.** states that the Dutch place emphasis on egalitarianism and are sceptical about the value of leadership. Terms like leader and manager carry a stigma. If a father is employed as a manager, Dutch children will not admit it to their schoolmates. This indicates that a term as a specific manager does not have much value in the Netherlands. Has this something to do with the overall mind-set of the country? There are many definitions known for leadership, yet there is no real agreed definition. But almost every definition has the same core, influencing other people to help accomplish group or organizational objectives. This paper defines leadership 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, as stated by (**House et al.**). **Kuratko & Hodgetts (2007)** define entrepreneurship as continuing to be critical contributors to economic growth through their leadership, management, innovation, research and development effectiveness, job creation, competitiveness, productivity and formation of new industry. To which **Kuratko (2007)** defines it as “the characteristics of seeking opportunities, taking risks beyond security, and having the tenacity to push an idea through to reality combined into a special perspective that permeates entrepreneurs”. As seen here many different angles are mentioned for the definition of entrepreneurial leadership. Therefore we acquired certain aspects of each definition and put it together for clustering to answer the difference in entrepreneurial leadership between Germany and the Netherlands.

Out of these definitions certain aspects can be drawn that match and can be found back within the masculinity-index. First from **Cunningham et al. (1991)** we can derive depending on others with the skills of motivating, directing, leading and to do this you need to be a “people manager”. Being a people manager indicates that cooperation with the employees is required. Cooperation is one of the aspects of femininity. For this reason we expect to see more motivating, directing and leading on employees in the Netherlands.

**Hypothesis 1:** *Dutch entrepreneurial leaders are more motivating, directing and leading on their employees than German entrepreneurial leaders.*

The second aspect, from **Kao (1989)**, tells us an entrepreneurial leader needs to define a possible vision and attract people around that. Attracting employees for the same visions will need good relations with the employees so they will follow the same vision. Relationship building is an aspect of femininity and therefore we expect to see more relationship building in entrepreneurial leaders in the Netherlands.

**Hypothesis 2:** *Dutch entrepreneurial leaders are more focused on defining a possible vision and attracting people around that vision than in Germany.*

Out of the definition of **House et al.** it is possible to derive the aspect out of influencing other employees to help accomplish success and organizational objectives. This definition shows that preference for achievement in the whole company is promoted. But also good cooperation is needed to accomplish this. One of these aspects belongs to masculinity and the other to femininity. Therefore we expect to find, influencing other employees to help

accomplish success and organizational objectives, both in German entrepreneurial leaders and Dutch entrepreneurial leaders.

**Hypothesis 3:** *There is no diversity in entrepreneurial leaders on influencing other employees to help accomplish success and organizational objectives between Germany and the Netherlands.*

The fourth aspect, from **McGrath, MacMillan (2000)**, creating competitive insights and finding new opportunities strongly tends to masculinity. One of the values of masculinity is competitiveness, so a clear similarity is visible. So we hypothesise that entrepreneurial leaders in Germany are more likely to create competitive insights and find new opportunities.

**Hypothesis 4:** *German entrepreneurial leaders are more likely to create competitive insights and to find new opportunities than Dutch entrepreneurial leaders.*

The last masculine aspect can be found in the **Kuratko (2007)**, taking risks beyond security. The overall way of risk-taking refers to more masculinity because material rewards for success are bigger in a masculine country. So we expect to find more risk-taking in masculine countries.

**Hypothesis 5:** *German entrepreneurial leaders are taking more risks than Dutch entrepreneurial leaders.*

Now the proposition can be made. We assume to find a tendency to femininity in Dutch entrepreneurial leaders and a tendency to masculinity in German entrepreneurial leaders. The proposition is that there is a significant difference between the entrepreneurial leaders in each country and hereby it is concluded that the masculinity-index is also visible in the way of acting of entrepreneurial leaders.

**Hypothesis 6:** *A difference in aspects is visible between German and Dutch entrepreneurial leaders and with this difference the MAS-index is also reflected within the entrepreneurial leaders*

### 3. RESEARCH METHOD

To answer the research question in this paper, detailed information on how the methodology was used is needed. Data is required on entrepreneurial leaders in how they influence their employees, take risks, motivate and set visions. To successfully carry out this research, information is necessary from the Netherlands and Germany. Subsequently the data of both countries need to be compared with each other with great care.

For this research interviews were conducted. The researcher personally went by companies and made sure the questions were answered in the correct way. Personally each researcher delivered at least five interviews. These were combined with delivered interviews from fifteen other researchers which brings a total of 76 interviews. For the interviewees it was only possible to answer the questions qualitative, with the reason to receive more indirect data from the respondent. In the interviews, a clear view is visible on the way they think about entrepreneurial leadership. The interview protocol (**Appendix A**) makes these questions visible. As a requirement the interviewees need to have at least 3 direct reports under them and one year of experience in a leadership position. See “**appendix A**” for the interview protocol. All the interviews were taken within 25 to 50 minutes and in the interview clear questions were asked that were really needed for the investigation. The questions asked about their way of thinking and how they should behave in their position. But also the way these questions are answered gives important insights. Like if someone responds shy or angry, this will all

weight along in the behaviour they have in some examples. The interviewees gave a good impression on how entrepreneurial leaders are dealing with their employees in certain situations and how they should not. By personally going along the respondents, occurring issues or question could be better dealt with and more information was exploited and collected. Further it was also possible to keep questioning, to learn as much as possible and to spot gestures and facial expressions. All this would not have been possible with a survey. In turn surveys would take care of a larger amount of respondents, so considerations had to be balanced out. This became possible with a collection of a greater amount of researchers with each their own interviews. Now better qualitative information was found while maintaining a good amount of respondents.

For comparing the two countries, Germany and the Netherlands, a clear distinction must be made whether all the interviews are taken into account. In total 51 (68,92) German and 23 (31,08%) Dutch entrepreneurial leaders have been interviewed, for 2 companies the country was unclear and will therefore be neglected. In order to ensure the validity there should be looked in the right way which variables may not vary widely. Age, it is logical to think that over the years, the way of thinking and thus the way of leadership will change. For the Dutch entrepreneurial leaders the age distributed with  $\mu$ :40,87 and  $\alpha$ :10,23 (Table A). The German entrepreneurial leaders have an age with  $\mu$ :43,47 with  $\alpha$ :11,24. But also the amount of direct reports in the company, this size may greatly influence the kind of entrepreneurial leadership. The Dutch companies direct reports are distributed with  $\mu$ :41,96 and  $\alpha$ :80,34 (Table B). The German companies have  $\mu$ :54,39 with  $\alpha$ :133,38. To be sure of a right generalizability in this paper we took all the held interviews and compared them between the countries.

Table A:

Report			
Age			
country	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
The Netherlands	40,87	23	10,226
Germany	43,47	51	11,242
Total	42,66	74	10,934

Table B:

Report			
reports			
country	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
The Netherlands	41,96	23	80,340
Germany	54,39	51	133,377
Total	50,53	74	119,010

Applying these interviews in this paper will be done with an individual investigation of each interview. Which in turn will be done with a qualitative research. All the interviews will be separately checked in both the countries and it will show what kind of diverse cultural behaviour aspect prevails for each entrepreneurial leader. This will be done with a separation in the values of entrepreneurial leadership. For each interview only question one and two will be investigated (Appendix A). With the assumption that the first called aspect, in the mind of the

interviewee, is the most important one. For this reason the first visible aspect in an interview is only included for the whole outcome of the specific interviewee. Eventually a T-test will be executed for each counted aspects. If the differences are significantly apparent in the interviews themselves and match with the corresponding masculine or feminine it shows the expectations have been confirmed. Since a qualitative research has been conducted, instead of quantitative, each question (Appendix B) will get investigated separately for coding and from the encoding it can be converted to quantitative. Although this paper will only focus on the international level in the differences between Germany and the Netherlands and not global, we expect it can serve as a good indication for masculinity studies between other countries. Provided that the research was attentive on the difference in the masculinity-index.

#### 4. ANALYSIS

In this part the findings of the report are shown in a systematic way by putting the theory to work. This chapter will explain what has been found.

##### 4.1 Entrepreneurial leadership aspects in the Netherlands

In this chapter the overall mind-set of entrepreneurial leadership in the Netherlands will be visible and all the found aspects will be explained.

In total 23 Dutch entrepreneurial leaders were interviewed and three of the five aspects have been found. For each important answer an explanation is given why it is linked with that specific aspect.

Table C:

1. Depending on others with the skills of motivating, directing, leading and being a people manager	13
2. Attracting employees for the same visions	5
3. Influencing other employees to help accomplish success and organizational objectives	5
4. Creating competitive insights and finding new opportunities	0
5. Taking risks beyond security	0

The first aspect of entrepreneurial leadership is found in the definition of **Cunningham et al. (1991)** and is seen most frequently among the held interviews. In total a number of important points can be mentioned about the entrepreneurial leaders in the Netherlands and with this it is possible to answer the question "What are the aspects of entrepreneurial leadership in the Netherlands?" As found in the interviews from the Netherlands the main methods for this are, working together and giving self-reflection. Working together indicates cooperation, cooperation is one of the main factors of femininity. But also asking the employees about the situation and asking them what is needed for good success. This shows having compassion for your employees. Another named aspect is to show that even the leader is not perfect and is uncertain about issues as well. In other words saying you are just the same as the employees in a modest way. Some other less given answers are: Giving the workers their space to find the best solution, to enable the employees to contribute towards success and running the business like your own to increase the influence. This can be achieved in the

Netherlands by letting them have responsibilities and involve them into the process. The biggest found motivator aspects are; going into a discussion with the employees and letting them learn from each other, enthusiast them and setting up clear goals. But also giving them space and confidence to go forward by themselves and also challenge the employees to come up with problems.

There are five different found factors in the interviews for the second definition, which is making a vision and attract the employees around that vision. The first, two times quoted, is the drive to develop entrepreneurship among the employees. Along the interviews these interviewees made it apparent that they were trying to be entrepreneurial. So as they stated, they would like for their employees to be entrepreneurial as well, they want them to have the same vision. The other factor is to let employees discuss their stories to bring them more together for example discussing about innovations. What matters here is bringing them together for discussing innovations. To ensure that all the employees have their thoughts on one line.

From the third aspect of House et al. another row of five factors were found in the answers of the interviewees. This aspect is classified as both masculine and feminine. This is because you are influencing your employees to let them help you, feminine, but doing this for the purpose of being successful, masculine. The first answer is giving space to the employees to find the answers themselves. Is subdivided under this definition because you are influencing your employees to ensure they come with new solutions. Or influencing the employees with trainings to improve their success. Providing training ensures that employees will get better at their job, so influencing to get success. Another called aspect is showing employees you trust them. For influencing other employees the managers answered with giving away some responsibilities twice. When you are giving away responsibilities as a manager it will be transferred to the employees. Employees get influenced because now they have the responsibility and are to blame when the objectives are not met.

Noticeable is that not even one interviewed manager mentioned an aspect that is related with high masculinity as the first item. On the other hand the managers did refer to competitive insights and taking risks, yet it was not their first thus most important aspect.

## 4.2 Entrepreneurial leadership aspects in Germany

In this chapter, the same as in the previous chapter, the main aspects for entrepreneurial leadership are visible, however this time for Germany. Each interview from German entrepreneurial leaders will be viewed separately to code the aspects. For each important answer an explanation is given why it is linked with that specific aspect. In total 51 German entrepreneurial leaders were interviewed and all the five aspects have been found throughout the German leaders.

Table D:

1. Depending on others with the skills of motivating, directing, leading and being a people manager	14
2. Attracting employees for the same visions	5
3. Influencing other employees to help accomplish success and organizational objectives	20
4. Creating competitive insights and finding new opportunities	9
5. Taking risks beyond security	3

The first aspect was found for 14 interviewees. Because this definition was classified as a feminine concept it was expected to find only a few answers. The answers varied widely, therefore only a listing will be given of the most important answers. To a certain extent employees motivation is mentioned the most, convincing the employees that what they were doing was good. Because “motivating” is precisely visible in the definition it is divided here. Another reason that was widely cited is making sure every employee is cooperating and also giving instructions to the people who did not participate. Cooperation is one of the main characteristics of feminism. Furthermore, two interviewees said that they discussed the activities before the job. This refers to managers directing the employees to do certain tasks. Leading was found one time where the manager directed his staff on a daily basis for more creativity.

For the second aspect, attracting employees for the same visions, 5 different answers have been found, this while it was expected to be a feminine aspect. Every manager had something else to say with another explanation but it all came to the same purpose of explaining new goals or concepts for the employees so they can apply them. Telling employees which goals to apply indicates to attracting them for the same vision.

It is strange to see that the most important aspect for German entrepreneurial leaders is the aspect which is both masculine and feminine. This which is in contrast with the masculinity-index. Most of the answers corresponded with the similarity of giving responsibilities to the employees. Giving responsibilities indicates you are influencing employees to do a better job. Because if something goes wrong, the employees are liable. But also other important answers were given. For example working together with the employees and trying to get commitment with them, instead of telling them what to do, to increase the company’s success. Let your employees work strength oriented to make sure everyone is thinking in innovative terms and are committed to take responsibilities. This answer is classified under this definition because the employees are being influenced to be strength oriented for better success.

The fourth aspect is found nine times among the interviewees. In the answers the interviewees stated; making opportunities to let them be creative and by not telling them what to do. So by not instructing the employees but instead letting them work for themselves they expect to find new opportunities. Another answer was letting employees work on project themselves so they are not bound to old results and can find new ideas, but can also bring together different employees to create new solutions. In a way these answers all refer to finding new opportunities. One interviewee answered with developing new target groups and

generate new partners, in other words finding new competitive insights.

The last aspect was found only three times. Acting with a certain amount of risk but also carrying the responsibility for it. Trying to be innovative and taking risks but there is little time for it. Every employee in a company needs to take his responsibilities and take risks. All the three answers mentioned taking risks as main subject. As expected this aspect has been found in German entrepreneurial leaders, taking risks for having success in material rewards is a clear factor of masculinity. Thus in its entirety certain aspects have become clear about the German way of entrepreneurial leadership and it became possible to answer the question “What are the aspects of entrepreneurial leadership in Germany.” First, the interviewees responded in their interviews with a lot of different answers on the first aspect. Wherein motivating of the employees was mentioned the most. Another often referred to answer was found in the third aspect of influencing employees by giving them more responsibilities. It is strange to see the two most common German answers both are not fully classified as masculine. We refer to this in the next chapter.

### 4.3 Differences in entrepreneurial leadership between Germany and the Netherlands

Based on previous research, it is possible to figure out what the differences are between Germany and the Netherlands. This section will illustrate the contrasts between both countries. This will be done with subdividing the found aspects in different parts. We will first elaborate on the five different aspects of entrepreneurial leadership.

The first contrast can be found in the first definition of **Cunningham et al. (1991)**. This aspect was expected to be fully feministic. As already indicated this aspect would therefore be only visible for Dutch interviewees. However in Germany the aspect was found even more in absolute numbers. Weighed against the total amount of held interviews of 23 in the Netherlands and 51 in Germany, the measurement is different in relative numbers. 13 divided by 23 = 56,52% and for Germany 14 divided by 51 = 27,45%. The question to ask ourselves is, how is it possible that an aspect, determined as feministic, has been found to this extent within German interviewees? To answer hypothesis one; are Dutch entrepreneurial leaders more motivating, directing and leading their employees than German entrepreneurial leaders a test is needed. Because of the way the study was conducted, this can only be answered with the chi-square test. For this test we assume there can be found a significant difference at least 95%. So when the answer is smaller than  $p < 0.05$  the hypothesis is accepted. The chi-square test shows a 2-sided sig of 0.016 (table E). This indicated the test shows  $p$  smaller than 0.05 and the hypothesis is accepted. Therefore we can say that it has been confirmed that Dutch entrepreneurial leaders are more into motivating, directing and leading their employees than in Germany.

Table E:

**country \* mas\_test\_asp1 Crosstabulation**

Count		mas_test_asp1		Total
		Aspect 1	Aspect 2,3,4,5	
country	The Netherlands	13	10	23
	Germany	14	37	51
Total		27	47	74

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5,781 <sup>a</sup>	1	,016		
Continuity Correction <sup>b</sup>	4,594	1	,032		
Likelihood Ratio	5,676	1	,017		
Fisher's Exact Test				,021	,017
Linear-by-Linear Association	5,703	1	,017		
N of Valid Cases	74				

a. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8,39.  
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

The second aspect of femininism derived from Kao (1989), seems to be almost the same and shows another unexpected difference. Also in Germany, with a masculine culture, 5 interviewees rated this aspect as most important. This compared with the 5 given answers in the Netherlands. So in relative numbers these are 21,74% in the Netherlands against 9,80%. To answer hypothesis 2: Dutch entrepreneurial leaders are more focused on defining a possible vision and attracting people around that vision than in Germany. For this test the chi-square test is needed again. There is a difference at a significance level of at least 95%. So when the answer is smaller than  $p < 0.05$  the hypothesis is accepted. However the test shows a two-sided sig. level of 0.165 and the hypothesis is rejected. So we can say there is no significant difference between Dutch and German entrepreneurial leaders in defining a possible vision and attracting people around that vision.

Table F:

**country \* mas\_test\_asp2 Crosstabulation**

Count		mas_test_asp2		Total
		Aspect 1	Aspect 2	
country	The Netherlands	5	18	23
	Germany	5	46	51
Total		10	64	74

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1,932 <sup>a</sup>	1	,165		
Continuity Correction <sup>b</sup>	1,046	1	,306		
Likelihood Ratio	1,811	1	,178		
Fisher's Exact Test				,268	,153
Linear-by-Linear Association	1,906	1	,167		
N of Valid Cases	74				

a. 1 cells (25,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3,11.  
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Influencing other employees to help accomplish success and organizational objectives has been classified with both masculine and feminine aspects. For this reason we had expected to see the same percentages relatively. Nevertheless, this appeared not to be the case with 21.74% against 39.22%. Hypothesis 3; There is no diversity in entrepreneurial leaders on influencing other employees to help accomplish success and organizational objectives between Germany and the Netherlands. For this test it just the other way around. When the answer is smaller than  $p > 0.05$  the hypothesis is accepted. With at least a  $p$  needed of 0.05 to find a significant difference but a found two-sided value of  $p = 0.141$  this hypothesis appears to be true. Therefore there is no significant difference between Dutch and German entrepreneurial leaders in influencing employees to accomplish success and other organizational objectives.

Table G:

country \* mas\_test\_asp3 Crosstabulation

Count		mas_test_asp3		Total
		Aspect 1	Aspect 2	
country	The Netherlands	5	18	23
	Germany	20	31	51
Total		25	49	74

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2,164 <sup>a</sup>	1	,141		
Continuity Correction <sup>b</sup>	1,454	1	,228		
Likelihood Ratio	2,265	1	,132		
Fisher's Exact Test				,188	,113
Linear-by-Linear Association	2,135	1	,144		
N of Valid Cases	74				

a. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7,77.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Aspect four, creating competitive insights and finding new opportunities, was expected to be masculine. This turns out to be true and the aspect is only found among German entrepreneurial leaders. In Germany 9 interviewees (17,64%) thought this aspect was the most important. Hypothesis 4: German entrepreneurial leaders are more likely to create competitive insights and to find new opportunities than Dutch entrepreneurial leaders. A significant difference is needed of 95%,  $p < 0.05$ , for the hypothesis to be accepted. However this significance is not met with a two-sided sig. level of  $p = 0.032$  so the hypothesis is rejected. There is no proof that German entrepreneurial leaders are more likely to find new opportunities and competitive insights compared with Dutch entrepreneurial leaders.

Table H:

country \* mas\_test\_asp4 Crosstabulation

Count		mas_test_asp4		Total
		Aspect 1	Aspect 2	
country	The Netherlands	0	23	23
	Germany	9	42	51
Total		9	65	74

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4,621 <sup>a</sup>	1	,032		
Continuity Correction <sup>b</sup>	3,117	1	,078		
Likelihood Ratio	7,249	1	,007		
Fisher's Exact Test				,050	,028
Linear-by-Linear Association	4,558	1	,033		
N of Valid Cases	74				

a. 1 cells (25,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2,80.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Kuratko's (2007) definition, taking risks beyond security, also appears to be only ingrained in the German mindset. However, only from 3 interviewees (5.88%) is derived that this is their most important aspect. Hypothesis 5; German entrepreneurial leaders are taking more risks than Dutch entrepreneurial leaders. When  $p < 0.05$  the hypothesis is accepted. In the chi-square test was found a two-sided value of  $p = 0.235$ . Therefore we can say this is not significant and that hypothesis 5 can be rejected. So there is no proof that German entrepreneurial leaders are taking more risks than Dutch entrepreneurial leaders.

Table I:

country \* mas\_test\_asp5 Crosstabulation

Count		mas_test_asp5		Total
		Aspect 1	Aspect 2	
country	The Netherlands	0	23	23
	Germany	3	48	51
Total		3	71	74

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1,410 <sup>a</sup>	1	,235		
Continuity Correction <sup>b</sup>	,303	1	,582		
Likelihood Ratio	2,290	1	,130		
Fisher's Exact Test				,548	,321
Linear-by-Linear Association	1,391	1	,238		
N of Valid Cases	74				

a. 2 cells (50,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is ,93.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

To answer hypothesis 6 an independent t-test was held to check if there is a significant difference visible. In this test the 5 aspects are scored on a different level. Aspect 1,2 are scored as 1, aspect 3 is scored as 2 and aspect 4,5 are scored as 3. This is done because otherwise it meant some aspects were more important than the other which is not the case. As can be seen in Table J: the independent T-test is conducted. Dutch entrepreneurial leaders have a SD of 0.422 and a SE of 0.088. The group of German entrepreneurial leaders have a SD of 0.775 and SE of 0.109. Levene's test shows us if equality of variance exists between these 2 groups. The Levene's test gives a value of 0.002, this value is lower than 0.05. We assume only that there is no equality of variance when the sig. is lower than 0.05. We can therefore assume the variances are not equal. From this independent t-test we want to know if there is a difference between the two countries. It is possible to say there is a significant difference once we can say with at least 95% certainty that this difference exists. This is the case when under sig. is a value lower than 0.05. As can be seen in Appendix C this sig. shows a value of  $p = 0.000$ , so lower than  $p$  of 0.05. So therefore we can say that there is a significant difference between Dutch entrepreneurial leaders and German entrepreneurial leaders in the masculinity-index. So with this independent t-test it is possible to answer hypothesis 6; "A difference is visible between German and Dutch entrepreneurial leaders and with this the MAS-index is also reflected within the entrepreneurial leaders". We are confident enough to verify that this is the case and that a difference is visible between the two countries.

Table J:

Group Statistics

country	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
aspect_combined The Netherlands	23	1,22	,422	,088
Germany	51	1,86	,775	,109

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t Test for Equality of Means								
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference			
aspect_combined	Equal variances assumed	10,229	,002	-3,742	72	,000	-.645	,172	Lower	-.989	Upper	-.302
	Equal variances not assumed			-4,620	69,910	,000	-.645	,140	Lower	-.924	Upper	-.367

#### 4.4 Explaining the difference with the masculinity index

This chapter will answer if the found difference between Germany and the Netherlands can be explained with the Masculinity index of both countries.

The MAS-index showed a difference between the Netherlands and Germany. This index of a cultural behaviour described the degree to which certain values are preferred in that country. **Hofstede (1980)** studied this masculinity index for both countries and found that the Netherlands with a MAS-score of 14 is very feminine and should contain quality of life, modesty and cooperation. Instead Hofstede found Germany with a high MAS-score of 66 and therefore should contain assertiveness, power, strength and self-centeredness in a high degree. Expected is that these scores have an influence in both countries on the way entrepreneurial leaders lead their business.

In the quantitative analysis some hypothesis were confirmed for significant differences. These confirmed hypothesis are that Dutch entrepreneurial leaders motivate, direct and lead their employees more than German leaders. Furthermore hypothesis 6, a significant difference is visible between the leaders in both countries for certain aspects, so the MAS-index is also reflected within the entrepreneurial leaders.

It has been found that the Netherlands differ from Germany in how they influence, motivate and let their employees contribute towards success. Whereby leaders in the Netherlands state as answer; give more responsibilities to the employees, while the Germans take this away. One of the values of masculinity is having power, transferring power to his employees reduces the entrepreneurial leader his own power. For this reason leaders in Germany maintain the power by not transferring responsibilities. Likewise the same can be said for femininity, cooperation is highly valued. So collaboration can be increased when responsibilities get divided between the employees. Where Germans try to motivate employees by increasing their guidelines, Dutch employees get motivated when they may bring up problems themselves and solve these.

So how is the difference in entrepreneurial leadership between Germany and the Netherlands explainable with the masculinity index? First notice, that however a difference has been proven, the difference is not that big as expected. It was expected that aspect 4 and 5 would have been chosen a lot more in Germany. As can be seen in TABLE D which is expected to reflect a trend towards aspect 4 and 5, masculinity, shows the opposite. And there still are more feminine aspects visible than masculine. So it is possible to say that Germany has more aspects of masculinity, but that the masculine culture is not strongly noticeable in the way entrepreneurial leaders manage their companies. In contrast, Dutch entrepreneurial leaders show exactly what was expected from them Table C. So it is possible to assume that the feminine culture has more influence in the entrepreneurial leaders acting in their country than it is the case for the leaders in the masculine culture.

So to give an answer to the sub question, "Can this difference be explained with the masculinity index?" The answer is yes, the difference can be explained, fully. All the studied aspects and factors show that the visible difference in entrepreneurial leadership is influenced by the cultural dimension, masculinity.

#### 5. DISCUSSION

Each company is different in size. And it is possible that a company with another amount of employees have a different structure. Within this structure it is possible that leaders have a different way of acting. This study has not further studied this data. The same applies to the different ages of managers. Managers also have different ages and it is possible that the age affects the way of thinking. Perhaps through the years their way of thinking, and with this the masculinity, is changing. Another point of discussion is that the encoding is done at its own discretion. It is quite possible that take for example "risk taking" has a complete different meaning for someone else.

The value of this paper has reached a good purpose. Knowing whether there is a difference in entrepreneurial leadership between the countries is useful when an employee approaches an individual entrepreneurial leader. This particular employee could reconsider if he should put forward a problem to his entrepreneurial leader. For example this paper shows employees in Germany will more often meet a more masculine leader than employees in the Netherlands. This kind of leader should be approached differently. Another theory already discussed about the link between masculinity and personal characteristics. **Brandstätter (2010)** published a paper in which a comparison is made with the Big Five with the characteristics, openness to experience, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, neuroticism but also other personality scales between entrepreneurs and management. Both reported a significant correlation with business creation and business success. Openness describes the breadth, depth, originality and complexity of individual's mental and experiential life. **Zhao and Seibert (2006)** report substantially higher scores on Openness than managers. Report of **Zhao et al. (2010)** shows a higher correlation of Openness exist with intention and performance than for the other four of the Big Five dimensions. Conscientiousness represents socially prescribed impulse control that facilitates task- and goal-directed behaviour. **Zhao et al. (2010)** found a positive correlation both in becoming an entrepreneur and entrepreneurial performance. Extraversion includes traits as sociability, activity, assertiveness and positive emotionality. Extraversion shows weak significant correlation with business performance **Zhao et al. (2010)**. Agreeableness is contrasted as prosocial and communal orientation towards others with antagonism and includes traits such as trust, modesty, altruism and tender-mindedness. Neuroticism contrasts Emotional Stability and even-temperedness with negative emotionality, like feeling nervous, sad, anxious and tense. A negative correlation between Neuroticism and entrepreneurial performance was found **Zhao et al. (2010)**. Similarities are apparent between these Big Five personality traits and the direction of Hofstede's cultural dimensions (**Migliore 2011**). **Hofstede and McCrae (2004)** published an article in which they linked the Big Five personality traits with the cultural dimensions. This research shows a correlation between the Masculinity index, as Cultural dimension, with openness to experience, neuroticism and agreeableness as personality traits. Openness to experience has a positive correlation of 0.40, same as neuroticism with 0.57. Agreeableness however has a negative correlation of -0.36. From this correlation can be drawn that an individual entrepreneurial leader in Germany is less agreeable but more neurotic and open to experience. Of course this also counts the other way around for the Netherlands. Other stakeholders and even the entrepreneurial leaders themselves may take this into account when making decisions. In the long term these decisions may benefit companies as a whole.



## 6. CONCLUSION

Since all the sub-questions have been answered, it is possible to answer the research question “Is there a difference in Dutch and German entrepreneurial leadership and is this explainable with the masculinity index?”. This study has shown that there is a clear difference between the way Dutch and German entrepreneurial leaders lead their business. In the way how they motivate, direct and lead their employees contribute towards success and continually let their employees find new ideas. Comparing leaders with the masculinity index clearly showed that there were several differences apparent between Germany and the Netherlands. Eventually this research has revealed a lot of differences which can be explained with the masculinity-index. The link made from cultural dimensions to personal traits showed that stakeholders in a company should adapt their way of doing business with entrepreneurial leaders between Germany and the Netherlands to increase the best possible outcome.

## 7. REFERENCES

- (sd). Opgehaald van <http://geert-hofstede.com/dimensions.html> .
- al., H. e. (sd). *CULTURAL INFLUENCES ON LEADERSHIP AND ORGANIZATIONS: PROJECT GLOBE*.
- Brandstätter, H. (2010). *Personality aspects of entrepreneurship: A look at five meta-analyses*.
- Hemphill. (1959). Job Descriptions for Executives. *Harvard Business Review* 37.
- Hofstede. (1980).
- Hofstede, G. (2012). *Allemaal Andersdenkenden omgaan met cultuurverschillen*.
- House, H. R.-Q. (sd). *CULTURAL INFLUENCES ON LEADERSHIP AND ORGANIZATIONS*.
- Kao. (1989). *Entrepreneurship and enterprise development*.
- Lischeron, B. C. (1991). *Defining entrepreneurship*.
- McCrae, H. a. (2004). *Linking Traits and Dimensions of Culture*.
- Mead. (1959). *Attribution to Benedict*.
- Migliore. (2011). Opgehaald van ([http://psychology.wikia.com/wiki/Masculinity\\_index](http://psychology.wikia.com/wiki/Masculinity_index)).
- Moldenhauer, J. V. (2001). *Nederland en Duitsland Elkaar kennen en begrijpen*.
- Seibert, H. Z. (2006). *The Big Five personality dimensions and entrepreneurial status: A meta-analytical review*.
- Zhao, S. L. (2010). *The relationship of personality to entrepreneurial intentions and performance: A meta-analytic review*.

