

Vito Bobek, PhD

Associate Professor
University of Applied Sciences FH Joanneum, Graz, Austria
E-mail: vito.bobek@fh-joanneum.at

Sarah Ana Bradler

Global Sales Operations at Alicona, Austria
E-mail: sarah.bradler@edu.fh-joanneum.at

Anita Maček, PhD

Research Associate
University of Applied Sciences FH Joanneum, Graz, Austria
Associate Professor
Doba Business School Maribor, Slovenia
E-mail: anita.macek@fh-joanneum.at

Tatjana Horvat, PhD

Assistant Professor
University of Primorska, Koper, Slovenia
Faculty of Management
E-mail: tatjana.horvat@fm-kp.si

DIFFERENCES IN LEADERSHIP IN AUSTRIA AND TAIWAN: A CROSS-CULTURAL ANALYSIS FOCUSING ON LEADERSHIP AND DISCRIMINATION

UDC / UDK: 005.5(436:529)

JEL classification / JEL klasifikacija: M12, M54, J71

Preliminary communication / Prethodno priopćenje

Received / Priljeno: July 18, 2019 / 18. srpnja 2019.

Accepted for publishing / Prihvaćeno za tisak: December 4, 2019 / 4. prosinca 2019.

Abstract

The objective of this paper is to analyse differences in leadership and discrimination in Austria and Taiwan. A quantitative as well as a qualitative study was conducted to identify differences between Austria and Taiwan regarding leadership and discrimination at the workplace. Data was gathered through an online survey. Findings showed that supervisors in Austria motivate their employees to reveal their full potential more than supervisors in Taiwan. In addition, it is identified that leaders and employees in Austria have easier access to further training for personal development than leaders and employees in Taiwan. As for discrimination at the workplace it was identified that discrimination by clients and suppliers and discrimination of minorities at the workplace is more prevalent in Taiwan than in Austria. Motivation of employees

and access to further training and personal development can minimize discrimination at the workplace.

Keywords: *culture, discrimination, business practices, leadership*

1. INTRODUCTION

Leadership nowadays requires supervisors to have a broad skill set. Beside external influences such as the omnipresent globalization and its impacts on companies, internal influences such as group dynamics, employee satisfaction and motivation of subordinates call for both technical and social skills in leaders. This paper sets a focus on two countries, Austria and Taiwan.

In a global environment, cross-cultural team work is performed daily all around the world. Basically, it can be stated that due to the cross-cultural context the aspect of culture is tremendously important regarding team leadership. Cultural competence is essential and determines whether a business is going to be successful or not. Culture combined with language, religion and other factors is a prerequisite for being successful when working in or leading an international team. The Globe Study is the latest study to such an extent; therefore, authors used it to identify the differences between Taiwan and Austria.

Leaders must deal with complex tasks in a demanding and fast changing working environment. They have to adapt to a challenging set of competencies to be effective in motivating and leading multinational teams nowadays (Rothacker & Hauer, 2014, p. 1). Beside cross-cultural differences and the daily workload on worksplaces. Discrimination is an omnipresent part of organizational life and is in literature often too simplistically framed and therefore often not correctly interpreted. Discrimination is mostly interpreted as a negative event; however, we should realize that it is basically neither positive nor negative, but very complex.

The objective of this paper is to analyze differences in leadership and discrimination in Austria and Taiwan. Section 2 provides theoretical backgrounds with explaining definitions for the most important terms used in the research. Section 3 brings literature review based on the analysis of cultural differences between Austrian and Taiwan culture. After outlining the methodology, research questions and hypotheses in Section 4, Section 5 discusses the results of the empirical analysis. Section 5 draws conclusions.

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUNDS

Basically, it can be stated that due to the cross-cultural context the aspect of culture is tremendously important regarding leadership of teams. Cultural competence is essential and determines if a business is going to be successful or not. Culture is defined in many ways depending on the discipline of the

researcher. Kroeber & Kluckhohn (1952) exposed more than 150 definitions of culture. Hofstede (1993), Hofstede & Hofstede (2005, p 4) stated the following definition of culture: "Culture consists of the unwritten rules of the social game. It is the collective programming of the mind that distinguishes the members of one group of people from others." Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (2002, p. 24) defined the culture as a dynamic process of solving human problems. According to Thomas (2010, p. 9) culture creates a structured environment within which a population can function. Culture combined with language, religion and other factors is a prerequisite for being successful when working in or leading an international team. According to DuBrin (2001, p. 121) leadership style is the relatively consistent pattern of behaviour that characterizes a leader. Different leadership styles may affect organizational effectiveness (Nahavandi, 2002).

Discrimination is defined as a behavior of an individual, organization or a group in which some people are treated differently from others (Cooper & Cooper, 2016). As a far more obvious form of workplace discrimination violence can be mentioned. It appears either in a physical or psychological way and is a widespread problem that can appear in different forms and can lead to severe disorders like post-traumatic stress disorder. Besides external penetrators, violent behavior can also derive from persons inside a company like colleagues. There are various consequences for companies as well as the victims of violence (Nienhaus, Drechsel-Schlund, Schamborski, & Schablon, 2016). To ensure a productive, effective and successful team work, discrimination either based on race, ethnicity, culture or religion must be eliminated to ensure a healthy, encouraging and diverse workplace.

3. LITERATURE REVIEW

There are numerous studies showing cultural dimensions of selected countries (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 2002; Chhokar, Brodbeck & House, 2007, p. 891; Hammer, 2013, House, Javidan, Hanges, & Dorfman, 2002, p. 6). As the Globe Study is the latest study to such an extent, authors used it to make the identification of cultural differences between Taiwan and Austria. Summarizing the findings of the study, all nine cultural dimensions were analyzed. In the mentioned study data for cultural dimensions are differentiated between practices and values. Practice data is derived from "what is" whereas value data is the results of "what should be" survey questions. The scores for 9 dimensions of cultural differences between Taiwan and Austria based on the GLOBE study are presented in the Table 1 below.

Table 1

9 dimensions of cultural differences between Taiwan and Austria

| Dimension | Country | Score “As Is” | Score “Should Be” |
|---|---------|------------------|----------------------|
| Power Distance <i>The extent to which the community accepts and endorses authority, power differences, and status privileges</i> | Taiwan | 5.18 | 3.09 |
| | Austria | 4.95 | 2.44 |
| Uncertainty Avoidance <i>The extent to which a group, organization or society depends on rules, procedures and social norms to deal with the unpredictability of the future events</i> | Taiwan | 4.34 | 5.31 |
| | Austria | 5.16 | 3.66 |
| Human Orientation <i>The extent to which a society encourages and rewards individuals for being generous, fair, altruistic, caring and kind to others</i> | Taiwan | 4.11 | 5.26 |
| | Austria | 3.72 | 5.76 |
| Institutional Collectivism <i>The degree to which organizational and societal institutional practices encourage and reward collective distribution of resources and collective action</i> | Taiwan | 4.59 | 5.15 |
| | Austria | 4.3 | 4.73 |
| In-group collectivism <i>The degree to which individuals express pride, loyalty, and cohesiveness in their organizations or families</i> | Taiwan | 5.59 | 5.45 |
| | Austria | 4.85 | 5.27 |
| Assertiveness <i>The degree to which individuals are assertive, confrontational and aggressive in their relationships with others</i> | Taiwan | 3.92 | 3.28 |
| | Austria | 4.62 | 2.81 |
| Gender Egalitarianism <i>The range to which a collective minimizes differences of gender roles</i> | Taiwan | 3.18 | 4.06 |
| | Austria | 3.09 | 4.83 |
| Long-term orientation <i>The extent to which individuals engage in future-oriented behaviors such as delaying gratification, planning, and investing in the future.</i> | Taiwan | 3.96 | 5.20 |
| | Austria | 4.46 | 5.11 |
| Performance orientation <i>The degree to which a collective encourages and rewards group members for performance improvement and excellence</i> | Taiwan | 4.56 | 5.47 |
| | Austria | 4.44 | 6.10 |

Source: GLOBE 2019.

As it can be seen from the Table 1 the result analysis for Taiwan and Austria in the GLOBE study has revealed several differences between the two cultures. Taiwan has a high strict hierarchically structured society and high tolerance for unequal distribution while Austria has lower tolerance and value score is much lower and indicated a lot of space and a strong need for improvement in this field. While Austrian and Taiwan practiced high score for order, consistency and structure, the value of uncertainty avoidance is in Taiwan even higher and Austrian much lower than the practiced value. Taiwan's value for a humane orientation are high meaning that both countries value fair, altruistic, generous, caring and kind behaviour, while Austrian practiced value for a humane orientation is lower than Taiwan's. Taiwan's and Austrian practiced value for institutional collectivism indicates that they value organizations in harmonic groups rather than individual. Nevertheless, Hofstede (2017) argues that Austria is an individualistic society with preference of individuals to take solely care of themselves and their family and a relationship between employer and employees is based on contracts with shared advantage (Hofstede, 2017). Taiwan's practiced value for in-group collectivism is high resulting in a high degree of loyalty for the groups they belong whereas Austria scores lower but also high. Taiwan's practiced value for assertive behaviour is lower than Austrian whereas assertiveness value score is lower in Austria. In both countries practiced value for gender equality is low and indicates that society favours men behaviour more than female-oriented behaviour. However, higher value scores indicate that in both countries there is a great support for gender equality. Especially in Austria equality is a topic that has been a hot issue since years, and a lot of improvements have to be made in the future to provide an equal base regarding payment and employment in professional life as well as in all day life. Taiwan and Austria are future, long-term oriented and pragmatic. Taiwan and Austria score high in regards to the encouragement and reward of people for performance.

Authors also found some studies researching different styles in leadership in selected countries, although not many exist for Austria and Taiwan. According to Reber, Auers-Rizzi & Mal (2004) Austrian leaders are reluctant in employing autocratic strategies for decision-making. Jago, Auer-Rizzi & Szabo (1998) exposed that Austrian managers show a tendency towards consultation and group decisions. Their study shows that the Austrian type of leadership is influenced by social background and that they have individualistic leadership style. On the other hand leadership structure in Taiwan is premised on the belief derived from the Confucian ideals that leaders are intelligent ethical individuals who know how to use their authority accordingly for the common good of people (Kao, Craven & Kao, 2006). For the comparison of the leadership styles GLOBE study was used. Results are presented in the Table 2 below.

Table 2

Leadership Scores for Outstanding Leadership in Taiwan and Austria

| Country | Charismatic | Team-oriented | Self-protective | Participative | Humane-Oriented | Autonomous |
|---------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|------------|
| Taiwan | 5.58 | 5.69 | 4.28 | 4.73 | 5.35 | 4.01 |
| Austria | 6.03 | 5.74 | 3.07 | 6.00 | 4.93 | 4.47 |

Source: *GLOBE*, 2019

The differences in cultural acceptance of the different leader styles manifest in concrete behaviours. As it can be seen from the Table 2 all scores except self-protection and human orientation are lower for Taiwan than for Austria. It can be concluded that Austrian leadership style is less self-protective and human oriented than Taiwan's. Furthermore, if we compare the results from the comparison of cultural dimensions and leadership styles we can conclude that higher power distance within a society is associated with stronger self-protective and human-oriented leadership and weaker charismatic and participative leadership.

4. METHODOLOGY

Before analyzing in-depth information on leadership and discrimination in Austria and Taiwan we stated the following research questions:

1. *What are the main differences in Leadership of teams in Austria compared to Taiwan?*
2. *Is discrimination considered as a present challenge in companies in Austria and Taiwan?*

To answer both research questions a combination of the theory and a quantitative study was used. This was regarded as suitable despite a very small number of companies, only 43, having subsidiaries in both countries because an acceptable number of respondents answered the anonymous survey. The list was provided by the Austrian chamber of commerce.

First, secondary data from online sources, journal articles, books, official websites and reports of international organizations as well as other sources were used to identify not only cultural differences, but also differences in leadership as well as if discrimination at the workplace is a present challenge in Austria and Taiwan. Based on the findings in the literature, research assumptions have been formulated. Second, a quantitative, as well as a qualitative study, were conducted to identify differences between Austria and Taiwan regarding leadership, whether discrimination related to several aspects is a present challenge in both countries as well as steps how to reduce or eliminate discrimination. Data was gathered

through an anonymous online survey that was translated into German, English as well as Taiwanese to overcome the language barrier and to enhance the number of respondents. It was created via Survey Monkey. It was made of 42 questions, including open questions as well as Likert-Scale Questions, to make a quantitative analysis possible. Related to the small size of the population of 43 companies doing business in Austria as well as Taiwan, the entire population should be included instead of a selected sample. However, several companies on the list were mentioned twice, only differentiating between different divisions therefore a list of 40 companies instead of 43 companies was usable for consolidation. However, 41 respondents answered the anonymous online-survey, which can be considered as a substantial number of respondents. Nevertheless, it must be mentioned that usually statistically a 30:30 rate is recommended when conducting a comparison between two countries to be able to generalize the results. However, in this study, including the respondents from the interviews, a rate of 25:25 was achieved, which is still considered appropriate for presenting valid differences between Austria and Taiwan related to the research questions.

In the process of literature research, hypotheses for the first research questions were created, which are displayed below:

H1: The main difference in Leadership of teams in Austria and Taiwan is found in the motivational impact of leaders on employees.

H2: The main difference in Leadership of teams in Austria and Taiwan is found in the support that is available from leaders to employees if questions or problems arise.

H3: The main difference in Leadership of teams in Austria and Taiwan is found in conducting performance reviews related to the career development of employees.

H4: The main difference in Leadership of teams in Austria and Taiwan is found in the provision of further training related to personal development.

H5: The main difference in Leadership of teams in Austria and Taiwan is found in the provision of further training related to professional development.

Similar to the first research question, hypotheses have been developed for the second research question, which is mentioned below:

H1a: Discrimination at the workplace is rather considered as a present challenge in companies in Austria than in Taiwan.

H1b: Discrimination at the workplace is rather considered as a present challenge in companies in Taiwan than in Austria.

H2a: Discrimination conducted by the supervisor at the workplace is rather considered as a present challenge in companies in Austria than in Taiwan.

H2b: Discrimination conducted by the supervisor at the workplace is rather considered as a present challenge in companies in Taiwan than in Austria.

H3a: Discrimination conducted by suppliers or clients at the workplace is rather considered as a present challenge in companies in Austria than in Taiwan.

H3b: Discrimination conducted by suppliers or clients at the workplace is rather considered as a present challenge in companies in Taiwan than in Austria.

H4a: Discrimination of minorities at the workplace is rather considered as a present challenge in companies in Austria than in Taiwan.

H4b: Discrimination of minorities at the workplace is rather considered as a present challenge in companies in Taiwan than in Austria.

H5a: Discrimination of colleagues at the workplace is rather considered as a present challenge in companies in Austria than in Taiwan.

H5b: Discrimination of colleagues at the workplace is rather considered as a present challenge in companies in Taiwan than in Austria.

In the following section results are presented.

5. RESULTS

Manova was conducted with the dependent variable (DV) including the motivational impact of the supervisor on his or her employees, the support of the supervisor when problems or questions arise, regular performance reviews in which the professional career development can be discussed, if further training to improves personal skills, such as social skills, as well as if further training to enhance the job-related skillset are available to leaders and employees. The independent variable (IDV) describes if leaders and employees work either in Austria or Taiwan. In the following Table 1 descriptive statistics are presented.

Table 3

General Linear Model: Descriptive Statistics

| | WorkinAustriaTaiwan | Mean | Std. Deviation | N |
|-----------------------------|---------------------|--------|----------------|----|
| Supervisormotivation | Austria | 4,3333 | 1,00722 | 24 |
| | Taiwan | 3,4400 | 1,22746 | 25 |
| | Total | 3,8776 | 1,20126 | 49 |
| Supervisorhelpproblems | Austria | 4,2500 | ,84699 | 24 |
| | Taiwan | 3,9600 | ,84063 | 25 |
| | Total | 4,1020 | ,84767 | 49 |
| Performancereviewcareer | Austria | 2,2500 | ,89685 | 24 |
| | Taiwan | 2,5200 | 1,38804 | 25 |
| | Total | 2,3878 | 1,16934 | 49 |
| Furthertrainingsocialskills | Austria | 4,4583 | ,72106 | 24 |
| | Taiwan | 3,6400 | 1,31909 | 25 |
| | Total | 4,0408 | 1,13577 | 49 |
| Furthertrainingjobrelated | Austria | 4,0000 | 1,17954 | 24 |
| | Taiwan | 3,9600 | 1,42829 | 25 |
| | Total | 3,9796 | 1,29887 | 49 |

Source: Own

As it can be seen from the Table 3 just regular performance reviews in which the professional career development can be discussed is evaluated higher in Taiwan than in Austria (mean score: 2,25 vs. 2,52). Other variables are evaluated higher in Austria. We also tested the significant differences between answers from both countries. Results are shown in the following Table 4.

Table 4

Test of significant differences

| Source | Dependent Variable | Type III Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Partial Eta Squared |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|----|-------------|----------|------|---------------------|
| Corrected Model | Supervisor motivation | 9,772a | 1 | 9,772 | 7,720 | ,008 | ,141 |
| | Supervisor problem | 1,030b | 1 | 1,030 | 1,447 | ,235 | ,030 |
| | Performance career | ,893c | 1 | ,893 | ,648 | ,425 | ,014 |
| | Further training social skills | 8,200d | 1 | 8,200 | 7,174 | ,010 | ,132 |
| Intercept | Further training obsolesced | ,020e | 1 | ,020 | ,011 | ,916 | ,000 |
| | Supervisor motivation | 739,894 | 1 | 739,894 | 584,520 | ,000 | ,926 |
| | Supervisor problem | 825,356 | 1 | 825,356 | 1159,347 | ,000 | ,961 |
| | Performance career | 278,607 | 1 | 278,607 | 202,263 | ,000 | ,811 |
| Work in Austria / Taiwan | Further training social skills | 803,057 | 1 | 803,057 | 702,622 | ,000 | ,937 |
| | Further training obsolesced | 775,856 | 1 | 775,856 | 450,411 | ,000 | ,906 |
| | Supervisor motivation | 9,772 | 1 | 9,772 | 7,720 | ,008 | ,141 |
| | Supervisor problem | 1,030 | 1 | 1,030 | 1,447 | ,235 | ,030 |
| Error | Performance career | ,893 | 1 | ,893 | ,648 | ,425 | ,014 |
| | Further training social skills | 8,200 | 1 | 8,200 | 7,174 | ,010 | ,132 |
| | Further training obsolesced | ,020 | 1 | ,020 | ,011 | ,916 | ,000 |
| | Supervisor motivation | 59,493 | 47 | 1,266 | | | |
| Total | Supervisor problem | 33,460 | 47 | ,712 | | | |
| | Performance career | 64,710 | 47 | 1,377 | | | |
| | Further training social skills | 53,718 | 47 | 1,143 | | | |
| | Further training obsolesced | 80,960 | 47 | 1,723 | | | |
| Corrected Total | Supervisor motivation | 806,000 | 49 | | | | |
| | Supervisor problem | 859,000 | 49 | | | | |
| | Performance career | 345,000 | 49 | | | | |
| | Further training social skills | 862,000 | 49 | | | | |
| Corrected Total | Further training obsolesced | 857,000 | 49 | | | | |
| | Supervisor motivation | 69,265 | 48 | | | | |
| | Supervisor problem | 34,490 | 48 | | | | |
| | Performance career | 65,633 | 48 | | | | |
| Corrected Total | Further training social skills | 61,918 | 48 | | | | |
| | Further training obsolesced | 80,980 | 48 | | | | |

Source: Own

Table 4 shows that there was a significant difference in the motivational impact of the supervisors on his or her employees in Austria and Taiwan when considered jointly on the variables empathic concern and perspective taking, Wilk's $\Lambda = .020$, $F(1/47) = 7.72$, $p = .008$, partial $\eta^2 = .141$. Two separated T-Tests were conducted for each DV, with each T-test at an alpha level of .025 (Bonferroni-corrected). Supervisors in Austria ($M=4,3$) motivate their employees to reveal their full potential more than supervisors in Taiwan ($M=3,4$). Additionally, there was a significant difference in the availability of further training to improve personal skills, such as social skills, in companies in Austria and Taiwan when considered jointly on the variable empathic concern and perspective taking, Wilk's $\Lambda = .020$, $F(1/47) = 7.17$, $p = .010$, partial $\eta^2 = .132$. As mentioned beforehand, separated T-Test were conducted for each DV, with each T-Test at an alpha level of .025 (Bonferroni-corrected). Leaders and employees in Austria ($M=4,45$) have easier access to further training related to personal development than leaders and employees in Taiwan ($M=3.64$).

Manova was conducted with the DV including discrimination at the workplace, discrimination at the workplace conducted by the supervisor, discrimination at the workplace performed by clients or suppliers, discrimination of minorities at the workplace as well as the discrimination of colleagues at the workplace. The IDV describes if leaders and employees work either in Austria or Taiwan. Results of descriptive statistics are shown in the following table 5.

Table 5

General Linear Model: Descriptive Statistics

| | WorkinAustriaTaiwan | Mean | Std. Deviation | N |
|------------------------------|---------------------|--------|----------------|----|
| Discrimatworkplace | Austria | 2,0526 | 1,07877 | 19 |
| | Taiwan | 2,1765 | 1,07444 | 17 |
| | Total | 2,1111 | 1,06309 | 36 |
| Discrimsupervisratwork | Austria | 1,6842 | ,88523 | 19 |
| | Taiwan | 2,0000 | ,86603 | 17 |
| | Total | 1,8333 | ,87831 | 36 |
| Discrimatworkbyclentsupplier | Austria | 1,6842 | ,47757 | 19 |
| | Taiwan | 2,6471 | 1,27187 | 17 |
| | Total | 2,1389 | 1,04616 | 36 |
| Discrimminoritiesatwork | Austria | 1,6842 | ,67104 | 19 |
| | Taiwan | 2,5294 | 1,23073 | 17 |
| | Total | 2,0833 | 1,05221 | 36 |
| Discrimofcolleaguesatwork | Austria | 1,3158 | ,47757 | 19 |
| | Taiwan | 1,3529 | ,78591 | 17 |
| | Total | 1,3333 | ,63246 | 36 |

Source: Own

As it can be seen from the Table 5 all variables are evaluated higher in Taiwan than in Austria. Again, we tested the statistical significant differences. Results are shown in the Table 6 below.

Table 6

Test of significant differences

| Source | Dependent Variable | Type III Sum of Squares | N | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Partial Eta Squared |
|---------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|----|-------------|---------|------|---------------------|
| Corrected Model | Discrimatworkplace | ,138 ^a | 1 | ,138 | ,119 | ,733 | ,003 |
| | Discrimsupervisoratwork | ,895 ^b | 1 | ,895 | 1,165 | ,288 | ,033 |
| | Discrimatworkbyclientsupplier | 8,318 ^c | 1 | 8,318 | 9,431 | ,004 | ,217 |
| | Discrimminoritiesatwork | 6,409 ^d | 1 | 6,409 | 6,738 | ,014 | ,165 |
| | Discrimofcolleaguesatwork | ,012 ^e | 1 | ,012 | ,030 | ,863 | ,001 |
| Intercept | Discrimatworkplace | 160,471 | 1 | 160,471 | 138,414 | ,000 | ,803 |
| | Discrimsupervisoratwork | 121,784 | 1 | 121,784 | 158,613 | ,000 | ,823 |
| | Discrimatworkbyclientsupplier | 168,318 | 1 | 168,318 | 190,839 | ,000 | ,849 |
| | Discrimminoritiesatwork | 159,298 | 1 | 159,298 | 167,472 | ,000 | ,831 |
| | Discrimofcolleaguesatwork | 63,901 | 1 | 63,901 | 155,326 | ,000 | ,820 |
| workinAustriaTaiwan | Discrimatworkplace | ,138 | 1 | ,138 | ,119 | ,733 | ,003 |
| | Discrimsupervisoratwork | ,895 | 1 | ,895 | 1,165 | ,288 | ,033 |
| | Discrimatworkbyclientsupplier | 8,318 | 1 | 8,318 | 9,431 | ,004 | ,217 |
| | Discrimminoritiesatwork | 6,409 | 1 | 6,409 | 6,738 | ,014 | ,165 |
| | Discrimofcolleaguesatwork | ,012 | 1 | ,012 | ,030 | ,863 | ,001 |
| Error | Discrimatworkplace | 39,418 | 34 | 1,159 | | | |
| | Discrimsupervisoratwork | 26,105 | 34 | ,768 | | | |
| | Discrimatworkbyclientsupplier | 29,988 | 34 | ,882 | | | |
| | Discrimminoritiesatwork | 32,341 | 34 | ,951 | | | |
| | Discrimofcolleaguesatwork | 13,988 | 34 | ,411 | | | |
| Total | Discrimatworkplace | 200,000 | 36 | | | | |
| | Discrimsupervisoratwork | 148,000 | 36 | | | | |
| | Discrimatworkbyclientsupplier | 203,000 | 36 | | | | |
| | Discrimminoritiesatwork | 195,000 | 36 | | | | |
| | Discrimofcolleaguesatwork | 78,000 | 36 | | | | |
| Corrected Total | Discrimatworkplace | 39,556 | 35 | | | | |
| | Discrimsupervisoratwork | 27,000 | 35 | | | | |
| | Discrimatworkbyclientsupplier | 38,306 | 35 | | | | |
| | Discrimminoritiesatwork | 38,750 | 35 | | | | |
| | Discrimofcolleaguesatwork | 14,000 | 35 | | | | |

Source: Own

Table 6 shows that there was a significant difference in the discrimination conducted by clients and suppliers at the workplace in Austria and Taiwan when considered jointly on the variables empathic concern and perspective taking, Wilk's $\Lambda = .027$, $F(1/34) = 9.43$, $p = .004$, partial $\eta^2 = .217$. Two separated T-Tests were conducted for each DV, with each T-Test at an alpha level of .025 (Bonferroni-corrected). Discrimination at the workplace conducted by clients and suppliers is more prevalent in Taiwan ($M=2.65$) than in Austria ($M=1.68$). Additionally, there was a significant difference in the discrimination of minorities at the workplace in Austria and Taiwan when considered jointly on the variable empathic concern and perspective taking, Wilk's $\Lambda = .027$, $F(1/34) = 6.74$, $p = .014$, partial $\eta^2 = .165$. Discrimination of minorities at the workplace is more prevalent in Taiwan ($M=2,53$) than in Austria ($M=1.68$).

6. DATA INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION

6.1. Research Question 1

The quantitative analysis showed that there was a significant difference in the motivational impact of the supervisors on his or her employees in Austria and Taiwan. Supervisors in Austria ($M=4,3$) motivate their employees to reveal their full potential more than supervisors in Taiwan ($M=3,4$). This result can be connected to the cultural differences of Austria and Taiwan elaborated upon in the literature part of the paper. According to the literature analysis Austria is considered as a rather individualistic country in which individual work and success is more important than compared to Taiwan as to be a collectivistic country, where individual results should not be awarded but group success should be celebrated. This further relates to the fact that in Austria employees are likely to be included into decision making as well as into adding individual work and ideas into team work to create a better output. To enhance such an active cooperation, motivation by the supervisor is needed. However, this is quite different in Taiwan where employees have a place in the system and would not contradict their bosses directly. Subordinates anticipate being told what to do. Despite this, incentives as well as bonuses for the group are considered appropriate and motivating. (Hofstede et al., 2010) This distinction may explain the lower score of Taiwan.

In addition, a significant difference in the availability of further training to improve personal skills, such as social skills, in companies in Austria and Taiwan was identified. Leaders and employees in Austria ($M=4.45$) have easier access to further training related to personal development than leaders and employees in Taiwan ($M=3.64$). To identify why additional qualitative as well quantitative analysis is recommended which would have exceeded the frame of this paper. However, one should be aware that due to the relatively low response rate the M-Box Test as well as partly the Levene-Test conducted in the analysis were significant and therefore all results shall be regarded with caution. The low response rate can be connected to the very small sample size of companies doing

business in both countries, Austria and Taiwan. For the first research question H1 can be verified.

6.2. Research Question 2

Hereof, a significant difference in the discrimination conducted by clients and suppliers at the workplace was identified between Austria and Taiwan. Discrimination at the workplace conducted by clients and suppliers is more prevalent in Taiwan ($M=2.65$) than in Austria ($M=1.68$). Further qualitative as well quantitative research is recommended to identify in which form this discrimination appears, which would have exceeded the frame of this paper. Moreover, there was a significant difference in the discrimination of minorities at the workplace in Austria and Taiwan. Discrimination of minorities at the workplace is more prevalent in Taiwan ($M=2.53$) than in Austria ($M=1.68$). As mentioned in the literature analysis Taiwan experiences an increasing awareness for the protection of minorities, disabled workers, elderly and women. This result highlights the strong need for intensifying Taiwan's efforts to re-join the international community and to incorporate international conventions such as ILO into the domestic laws as well as enhance regulations that have been formed by municipal cities as well as city governments throughout Taiwan. However, as mentioned above all results shall be regarded with caution. For the second research question H3b as well as H4b can be verified.

7. CONCLUSIONS

Taiwan and Austria differ tremendously regarding culture and leadership. This paper dealt with two research questions. The first one asked for the main differences in Leadership of teams in Austria compared to Taiwan. To answer this question, a quantitative analysis was conducted. The following differences were identified:

- Supervisors in Austria motivate their employees to reveal their full potential more than supervisors in Taiwan.
- Leaders and employees in Austria have easier access to further training related to personal development than leaders and employees in Taiwan.
- The second research question asked if discrimination based on several aspects is considered as a present challenge in companies in Austria and Taiwan. Therefore, a quantitative study was conducted. Subsequently, the results are displayed:
- Discrimination at the workplace conducted by clients and suppliers is more prevalent in Taiwan than in Austria.
- Discrimination of minorities at the workplace is more prevalent in Taiwan than in Austria.

However, like all other research papers, the scope of this work is limited by several aspects. First, it should be outlined, that all data presented in this paper are related to the dynamic and fast changing global environment and represents a specific point in time. However, it should be recognized, that several discriminatory practices are not only part of the society, but more part of the culture. Several aspects are well known for decades but change very slowly due to their deep root in the cultural setting. This is represented in the international orientation of companies which is usual nowadays. Even though the global environment is changing very fast, the cultural values, norms, traditions and practices mostly remain, or change slowly in terms of globalisation and internationalisation of companies. Therefore, the data may only represent a specific point in time, however, discrimination was always, is currently and will be part of future. It may be different in form, execution, target group and may change over time but it is a challenge which people must be aware of and that must be fought until everyone, regardless their skin colour, nationality, heritage, religion, gender, sex, disability or sexual orientation, is able to live a free life.

Based on the findings discovered, further research is recommended to observe the development in both countries related to current crises, such as the refugee crises that presently has an impact on Austria. Hereof, the study could be further enlarged to include more companies from Austria and Taiwan and therefore conduct more interviews as well as increase the number of respondents of the survey to make a more in-depth qualitative as well as quantitative analysis. Finally, this study might be extended based on the findings presented above to find out why these differences are apparent.

REFERENCES

Chhokar, J. S., Brodbeck, F. C., House, R. J. (eds.). 2007. *Culture and leadership across the world: the GLOBE book of in-depth studies of 25 societies*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cooper, C. L., Cooper, P. 2016. *Risky Business: Psychological, Physical and Financial Costs of High Risk Behavior in Organizations*. CRC Press.

DuBrin, A. J. 2001. *Leadership: research findings, practice, skills*, 3rd ed. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

GLOBE. Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness. 2019. County List. <https://globeproject.com/results/countries/TWN?menu=list#list>

Hammer, J. 2013. GLOBE Study of 62 societies on a world map. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jKY8FhMPLEA>

Hofstede, G. 1993. *Interkulturelle Zusammenarbeit: Kulturen, Organisationen, Management*. Wiesbaden: Gabler.

Hofstede, G. 2017. Cultural Dimensions – Geert Hofstede. <https://geert-hofstede.com/cultural-dimensions.html>

Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J. 2005. *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J., Minkov, M. 2010. *Cultures and organizations: software of the mind: intercultural cooperation and its importance for survival*, 3rd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.

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*, Vol. 37, No. 1, pp. 3-10. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1090-9516\(01\)00069-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1090-9516(01)00069-4)

Jago, A. G., Auer-Rizzi, G., Szabo, W. 1998. "Führungsstile in sieben Ländern Europas – Ein interkultureller Vergleich". In: Schuler, H. (ed.), *Personalmanagement in Europa*, pp. 127-239. Stuttgart: Poeschel.

Kao, H., Craven, A. E., Kao, T.-Y. 2006. "The relationship between leadership style & demographic characteristics of Taiwanese executives". *International Business & Economics Research Journal*, Vol. 5, No. 2, pp. 35-48.

Kroeber, A. L., Kluckhohn, C. 1952. *Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions*. Cambridge, MA: Peabody Museum.

Nahavandi, A. 2002. *The art and science of leadership*, 3rd ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Nienhaus, A., Drechsel-Schlund, C., Schambortski, H., Schablon, A. 2016. "Violence and discrimination in the workplace. The effects on health and setting-related approaches to prevention and rehabilitation". *Bundesgesundheitsblatt, Gesundheitsforschung, Gesundheitsschutz*, Vol. 59, No. 1, pp. 88-97. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00103-015-2263-x>

Reber, G., Auers-Rizzi, W., Mal, M. 2004. "The behaviour of managers in Austria and Czech Republic: An intercultural comparison based on the Vroom/Yetton Model of Leadership and decision making". *Journal of East European Management Studies*, Vol. 9, No. 4, pp. 411-429. <https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/90400/1/769488803.pdf>

Rothacker, A., Hauer, G. 2014. "Leadership in Multinational Management – A Behavior Set to Motivate Multicultural Teams". *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Vol. 130, pp. 226-236. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.04.027>

Thomas, A. 2010. "Culture and cultural standards". In: Thomas, A., Kinast, E., Schroll-Machl, S. (eds.), *Handbook of intercultural communication and cooperation*, Vol. 1: *Basics and Areas of Application*, 2nd edition, pp. 17-28.

Trompenaars, F., Hampden-Turner, C. 2002. *Riding the waves of culture: Understanding cultural diversity in business*. London: Brealey.

Dr. sc. Vito Bobek

Izvanredni profesor
Sveučilište primijenjenih znanosti FH Joanneum, Graz, Austrija
E-mail: vito.bobek@fh-joanneum.at

Sarah Ana Bradler

Global Sales Operations u Aliconi, Austrija
E-mail: sarah.bradler@edu.fh-joanneum.at

Dr. sc. Anita Maček

Znanstvena suradnica
Sveučilište primijenjenih znanosti FH Joanneum, Graz, Austrija
Izvanredna profesorica
Doba Business School Maribor, Slovenija
E-mail: anita.macek@fh.joanneum.at

Dr. sc. Tatjana Horvat

Docentica
Sveučilište Primorska, Kopar, Slovenija
Fakultet za menadžment
E-mail: tatjana.horvat@fm-kp.si

RAZLIKE U VODSTVU U AUSTRIJI I TAJVANU: MEĐUKULTURALNA ANALIZA USMJERENA NA VODSTVO I DISKRIMINACIJU

Sažetak

Cilj je rada analizirati razlike u vodstvu i diskriminaciji u Austriji i Tajvanu. Provedena je kvantitativna i kvalitativna studija kako bi se utvrdile razlike između Austrije i Tajvana u pogledu vodstva i diskriminacije na radnome mjestu. Podaci su prikupljeni na temelju internetske ankete. Nalazi su pokazali da nadzornici u Austriji motiviraju svoje zaposlenike da pokažu svoj puni potencijal više od nadzornika u Tajvanu. Također je utvrđeno da čelnici i zaposlenici u Austriji imaju lakši pristup daljnjem usavršavanju radi osobnog razvoja od onih u Tajvanu. Glede diskriminacije na radnome mjestu, ustanovljeno je da je diskriminacija koju provode klijenti i dobavljači te diskriminacija manjina na radnome mjestu rasprostranjenija na Tajvanu nego u Austriji. Motivacija zaposlenika te pristup daljnjem osposobljavanju i osobnom razvoju mogu umanjiti diskriminaciju na radnome mjestu.

Ključne riječi: kultura, diskriminacija, poslovne prakse, vodstvo.

JEL klasifikacija: M12, M54, J71.

