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ABSTRACT

Purpose – This study focuses on leadership and delegation in academic institutions. Further, study aims to explore the impact of culture on leadership and delegation by studying academic institutions in two drastically different countries, Sweden and Pakistan.

Methodology – As this study has a qualitative approach, the data for this study been gathered from 12 interviews with the members of the faculty and the head of the departments from the two universities from Pakistan and from Sweden.

Findings – Leadership in Sweden and in Pakistan is perceived in a similar way in an academic setting, even though it may appear that countries under investigation seem to be strongly quite opposite to each other. Higher amount of guidance is being expected in Pakistan from the head of the department regarding the work-related details. In Sweden guidance by the head of the department is not that strongly expected. In both countries it is expected that the leader in academic institutions is transformational.

Originality – The findings of this study challenge the preconception that Sweden and Pakistan are two countries with strongly different cultures and similarly different leadership and delegation perception. Therefore, this study also gives an interesting input to explore more if in academic context other countries would show similar patterns and also it would be interesting to test it through a quantitative approach.
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1 INTRODUCTION
In this chapter the background of the thesis, the research problem discussion, research questions and the purpose of the thesis are being discussed. Furthermore, a layout of the thesis is being presented.

1.1 Background
These days we could often find ourselves thinking how much the technology has evolved and still keeps evolving. Because of the technological advances that we get to enjoy daily, innovation has created links between places in the physical world and in the places on the Internet in a way that the physical world and virtual have become attaced to each other (Buckley and Ghauri, 2004). Because of the strong connection between the two “worlds” we have become open for discovering places other than our birth country, we have developed a greater desire to know about other cultures. We travel around, experience different places and we see the world as our personal marketplace and push for international activities. Simply, because the younger generation is more exposed to the international environment thanks to the technological advances, limits of time and space, and opportunities increase to study abroad (Andersson et al, 2004).

Students travel and receive their education in foreign countries. A huge effect on that has been through Erasmus programs that support training, education, sport and youth in Europe (“Erasmus+ is the”, 2018). These programs have been running for 30 years now, and since then more than 4 million students have benefited from Erasmus during their higher education, both for bachelors and masters studies (“Erasmus+ factsheet”, 2018). These students often continue their studies abroad as well for PhD, and also during the PhD, there can often be exchange with the aim of collaboration between different institutions. Furthermore, after receiving PhD many fresh graduates are looking for opportunities to get some hands on experience through postdoctoral researcher positions, which normally are done in another country different from where they received their PhD. Eventually, you have a long experience in living and studying in different countries and you might become much more open to live in foreign country. Because of that academic environments or settings tend to be much more diverse.

Because we travel around and experience different places more closely, we are perhaps closer than ever to see the differences that we have compared to each other. Perceptions towards work have significantly changed and there is much more emphasis towards multicultural teamwork (Kappagomtula, 2017). This at the same time creates issues or problems among diverse teams, for
example language problems, behaviour in the groups might vary depending on the cultural background and also trust building among the members how the group can be challenging (Kappagomtula, 2017). Managing a diverse workforce can be challenging, but yet it is found to provide company with competitive advantages, plus it could give companies the ability to adapt to the changes of the market place more than their competitors (Shaban, 2016). That’s why, as a leader or a manager, it is important to understand the differences that the diversity creates because then one as a leader can develop a better approach towards managing a diverse workforce. Leadership and delegation have extensively been addressed in literature about companies (Yammarino, 1998; Klein and House, 1995; Gardner and Avolio, 1998; Jung and Avolio, 1999; Chen and Arvees, 2007). But, leadership and delegation in academic environments has not been given much attention to the best of author’s knowledge. Furthermore, when it comes to academic institutions and their environmental settings, we still don’t have much knowledge how does culture influence the work outcomes and what are the issues that can arise or if there are problems at all that are influenced by cultural differences.

When it comes to leader–member exchange (LMX) and delegation various studies have been conducted. As it will be discussed in the theoretical framework of this study, LMX is considered to be a relationship-based approach towards leadership that puts its focus on dyadic relationship between the leader and the follower (Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1995). Stronger correlations between delegation and LMX in Germany has been found compare to United States of America (Drescher, 2017). In a same way similar study shows that people from the United States of America prefer higher amount of delegation from their leaders compared to Malaysians (Drescher, 2017). Similarly, cultural variations of leadership prototypes across European countries have been studied and the result of that study shows that leadership porotypes vary as a cultural difference in Europe (Brodbeck et al, 2000). These studies are based mainly on private companies and do not give much emphasis on academic settings, also interestingly there are not many studies about Sweden or Pakistan.

Previous study has shown that when it comes to the leadership style, Swedes tend to give more responsibilities to the employees and are keener to listen for the ideas and opinions (Zabihi, 2013). We have developed an understanding about the way leadership is being implemented companies in Sweden, but we do not know the perception of it in academic institutions, as there are not significant amount of studies done when it comes to leadership and delegation in the best of
Similarly, assessment of leader-member exchange has been studied in Pakistan before among teaching faculty serving in different positions at private or public sector (Ishaq et al, 2012), but again there are no concrete studies about leadership and delegation perceptions in academic institutions. Furthermore, there are no previous studies know about perceptions towards leadership and delegation comparing differences between Sweden and Pakistan when it comes to leadership perception in academic institutions among the members of the faculty. This brings us to the problem discussion in the following section.

1.2 Problem discussion

Among different aspects affecting leader-follower relationship is the cultural difference arising from cultural backgrounds of leaders and employees. These days we can more and more see this as problem on everyday basis, as the world has become more open and interaction between different cultures is becoming an everyday situation. In order to perform better as a leader, it is important to know what kind of effect cultural background can have towards employees’ perception of leadership. This has also been pointed out as an interesting and significant aspect, that needs thorough investigation (Drescher, 2017).

Cultural background, for instance, can have significant effect on how delegation is expected and perceived by employees, as pointed out by Drescher, 2017. Cultural difference can also lead to misunderstandings in environments that consist of individuals with different mother tongues and varying levels of a second language competency. Another example is the level of emotional expression that might be common in one culture and might not be in another. Similarly, level of trust can also be dependent on leader as well as followers’ cultural background (Kappagomtula, 2017). Therefore, it is important to investigate the level, and different ways, in which cultural-background difference effects leader-follower relationships and thus efficiency and productivity of an organization.

When we look at Pakistan and then Sweden, we see them as completely different countries, with completely different culture and values. Strong influence on this kind of understanding definitely comes from media – the things that we hear from news. Often Pakistan would give us a vibe of a country where it is not that safe, where people are strongly religious and, in some way, extreme in practicing their religion. Women in Pakistan might be viewed as being oppressed as they are covering themselves or that they not allowed to work etc. When it comes to Sweden, we see Sweden as a country that is completely opposite to Pakistan, a place where everyone has equal
rights, there is freedom of practicing religion the way you wish or not practicing any religion at all. Feminism is highly promoted in Sweden and can express yourself the way you wish as a woman in Sweden.

As it is seen, there are different perceptions of these two countries that one could have. As the author of this study is Estonian and she has lived in Pakistan for almost two years and also for a year in Sweden, she has a different view of Pakistan compared to the general view that most people might be having who have not lived there (like described above). As the author has experienced the actual culture and the way of life in Pakistan (that from her opinion does not match with the stereotypical or common opinions) and also the way of life in Sweden, she has found it interesting to investigate deeper possible differences and similarities in leadership and delegation perceptions between Sweden and Pakistan – the countries that initially seem so far from each other both from distance and culture.

As discussed above, these two countries – Pakistan and Sweden, differ from each other in many ways when viewing them from distance. For example, most Swedes tend to be more towards atheism but in Pakistan religion is strong part of the everyday life; Swedes prefer to avoid strong interaction with each other but in Pakistan active communication with each other is an important part of life. As these countries should be showing different extremes, as it would be expected by most people, it would be interesting to put it on a test through this study, to see how strong these expected differences actually are. Furthermore, academic institutions do not receive attention from the researchers when it comes to studying leadership and delegation in every day basis. Seeing how leadership and delegation are perceived in academic settings could enrich our understandings about these two phenomena even further. In companies normally, cultural differences are something that needs to be taken under consideration in order to be more successful. We still lack knowledge if that applies in academic institutions and how the leadership and delegation are being perceived when it comes to academic institutions.

1.3 Research Question

The following research question is raised and addressed in this study: How are leadership and delegation perceived in academic institutions and if culture has an impact on these perceptions?

To make the study even more effective, I
1.4 Purpose
Leadership and delegation have not investigated that vigorously in an academic context, so, therefore, this study aims to explore how leadership and delegation are perceived in the settings of this study. Furthermore, this study seeks to investigate more leader-member exchange (LMX) in an academic context in different environments through the examples of Sweden and Pakistan. Secondly, another aim of this study is to view if there are actually many differences between Sweden and Pakistan. As mentioned above, that the author of this study has experienced entirely different Pakistan compared to the Pakistan that is being portrayed by the media to the world and similarly has experienced the way of life in Sweden. In a situation where there would be sharp differences between two countries, it should show through the way leadership and delegation might be perceived differently in the universities in both selected countries.

1.5 The layout of the thesis
The current chapter has introduced the problem and context of the thesis. The entire thesis is structured as follow:

i) Chapter 1 gives the introduction to the research problems of the thesis;

ii) Chapter 2 build a theoretical framework of this study;

iii) Chapter 3 presents the methodology that is being used for conducting this study;

iv) Chapter 4 aims to present the results of the study;

v) Chapter 5 analyses the findings of the study and;

vi) Chapter 6 gives the conclusion of the study.

Figure 1. The layout of the thesis
2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter gives an understanding of the main concepts that this study is focusing on. Main subjects discussed in this chapter are: i) Leadership; ii) Cultural differences and iii) Leader-member exchange theory (LMX). As this study seeks to investigate leadership in academic institutions through examples of Sweden and Pakistan, it is necessary to understand leadership and cultural differences as the study also seeks to compare the differences in both countries. Furthermore, as this study aims to understand the delegation perceptions and expectations it is also needed to talk about the relationship between the leader and the follower and therefore leader-member exchange theory is being discussed. The figure below visualizes the main layout of the theoretical framework.

![Theoretical Framework Diagram](image)

**Figure 2.** The layout of the theoretical framework. Leadership is related to cultural differences in this study as this study aims to compare differences in leadership perception between Sweden and Pakistan. Similarly, cultural differences and LMX are in relations as this study aims to investigate the differences in delegation perception between Sweden and Pakistan.

2.1 Leadership

Leadership has been seen as a capability to influence others and also the way others act (Yusof et al., 2014). It also consists of a selection of skills like for example analytical conceptual skills in order to have an influence on task goals, approach, and interpersonal and persuasive skills in order to have an impact on individuals to put strategies and goals into action (Yusof et al., 2014).
According to the neo-charismatic paradigm, the exceptional leaders communicate a vision that has strong ideological standards and firm imagery, and they also trigger thinking that creates new innovative solutions to large-scale problems and also emphasize on high performance (Waldman et al., 2006; Shamir et al., 1993). Also, the leader creates great extent of employee confidence, motivation, reliance, emotional appeal and organization (Waldman et al., 2006; Shamir et al., 1993). Supportive leadership studies have found that the behaviour of the leader shapes sub feelings of outcomes which greatly have an effect on the efficiency (Banai and Reisel, 2007). The definition of effective leadership can differ based on the culture (Javidan et al., 2006). The things that we expect from the leaders and what our leaders do not do or do, and also their status or impact towards us varies depending on the cultural influences that are significantly dominating in the countries where the leaders are operating (Javidan et al., 2006). There is also another interesting approach towards leadership that states that leadership can have three domain approach, which can be taken in order to achieve organizational objectives, with respect to leadership types (Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1995). These three domains are: i) leader-based where the main focus is on the leader; ii) relations-based that places its main focus on the dyadic relationship between the leader and the follower and iii) follower-based that gives focus mainly on the issues in relation with the follower (Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1995). Each of these domains should be viewed in relation to each other in order to generate a new set of questions around the issues of how characteristics of the leader, follower and the relationship have interaction between each other in order to have an influence towards leadership outcomes (Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1995). It has been stated that the social and somewhat emotional competencies have to be implemented to reach the most effective leadership approach which is considered to be transformational leadership style (Yusof et al., 2014). Transformational leadership aims to create a much closer relationship between the leader and follower, and this relationship is based on trust and engagement (Jung and Avolio, 1999). Leaders who are transformational guide their followers to see why it is important to transcend their self-interest for the good of the vision and mission of the team or the company (Jung and Avolio, 1999). Leaders who work on building the confidence, self-esteem and efficiency of the followers are expected to have a positive and great impact on followers’ level of recognition, target achievement and motivation (Yammarino, 1998; Klein and House, 1995; Gardner and Avolio, 1998; Jung and Avolio, 1999). Some studies conducted in Pakistan have shown that the members of the faculty in public and private sector institutions do practice transformational leadership to some extent (Tipu et al., 2012). On the other hand transactional leadership has been said to have a more motivating approach towards followers through contingent-reward-based exchanges (Jung and Avoloio, 1999). What it means is that transactional leaders place their main attention on setting
targets, creating a clear correlation between performance and awards and also making sure that the followers receive constructive feedback to keep the followers on their tasks (Yammarino et al., 1998; Jung and Avolio, 1999). Swedish organisations have been described to be horizontal and therefore much more open to the opinions of the employees (Zabihi, 2013). Also, management in Sweden is strongly encouraging innovation and new ideas, and conflicts are something that is being tried to avoid through creating mutual understandings (Zabihi, 2013). When we talk about leadership and how it is being implemented inside an organization, it is also important to take a closer look if and how there can be some linkage between the leadership styles and organisational culture and the connection of these two with the outcome or performance (Ogbonna and Harris, 2000). Leadership style has been found not to have a strong connection with the way the organisation is performing, and rather the leadership style has an indirect connection with the performance. More effect on performance play innovative cultural traits and being competitive (Ogbonna and Harris, 2000). Organisational culture can be defined as sharing some general understanding, values or beliefs in an organisation and passing on these beliefs or values also to the newcomers so that they can feel, think or even communicate based on these values (Schneider et al., 2013)

2.2 Cultural differences

The term culture has been described as collective programming of the mind of the human that singles out the members of a specific human group from another (Dickson, 2012). Culture is considered to have an enormous impact on the styles of leadership, and it has stated that the traditions, norms, values and understandings transmit a power that differentiates (Ralston, 1993; Shenkar, 1987 and House R. J., 2002). In the Global Leadership and Organizational Behaviour Effectiveness (GLOBE) model has defined culture as having common ideas, beliefs, morals, values and understandings about specific events that come from common knowledge or experiences of the members of the society or community and are passed on across generations (House, 2004). When we talk about cultural differences, and even more when the groups consist of cross-cultural or multicultural members, and when the works carried out have complicated setting of many different activities that tend to have specific timeframe, scope of work constraints and cost, a leader more or less faces following problems or challenges (Kappagomtula, 2017):

i) language barriers;
ii) behaviour and cultural diversities;
iii) gender perceptions;
iv) trust building difficulties;
v) collaborators expectations and
vi) having synergy among the members of the team.

When it happens that the perception of the leadership or understanding differentiates in the mind of the follower compare to his or her host country with his or her home country, there are high possibilities for the non-acceptance of the leadership (Brodbeck, 2000). Cross-cultural researchers advocate that culture has possibilities to have an effect on the concepts of leadership (Brodbeck, 2000). A study by Hofstede dives into the dimensions of national culture where it has been stated that there are four statistically-independent dimensions that would explain the variations inside one particular country; these dimensions are power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism and masculinity (Hofstede, 1980). In addition, great example of how the nature of the culture is highly recognized regarding leadership, is the fact that the countries with higher power distance values long for a leader that behaves in a rule, and at the same time is being orientated, and also for someone who heavily displays his or her status difference between themselves and their employees (Dorfman, 2012). Leading a workforce that is diverse has a nature to be challenging but at the same time it is found to grant company with great competitive advantage and it also would give firms a capability to be more adaptable when it comes to adapting to the changes of the market where the company is operating compare to their rivals or competitors (Shaban, 2016). Cultural adaptability has been stated as ‘‘the capacity to substitute activities enjoyed in one’s home country with existing, and usually distinct, activities in the host country’’ and a study suggests that the cultural adaptability is in correlation with cross-cultural flexibility, self-confidence, self-esteem, acclimation and successfulness in fulfilling tasks at the foreign workplace (Caligiuri, 2012).

### 2.3 Leader member exchange theory (LMX)

When concentrating on leadership and the importance of culture in leadership perception process, it is necessary to put a focus on the relationship among the leader and the follower and therefore also make clear the definition of the leader-member exchange (LMX). The LMX theory has been broadly addressed in the leadership literature, for instance by Dansereau Jr, 1975; Graen, 1976; Graen 1975; Graen, 1982; Graen, 1987 and Wakabayashi, 1984. Pellegrini and Scandura (2006) state that researchers have gestated delegation to be the result of high-quality leader-member exchange relationship (“in-group”). LMX has been found to be an outcome and also an antecedent of delegation (O’ Donnell et al., 2012). Furthermore, the likeability of the leaders mediates a positive interconnection between the delegation and the satisfaction of the employee and also the
way employees' perceive the performance of leaders (Drescher, 2017). It has also been stated that the leader-member exchange theory describes the quality of dyadic relations, for example between leader and the follower (Uhl-Bien et al., 2000). LMX has also been defined as an approach that is relation-based towards leadership that gives attention to the reliance between a leader and a follower (O’ Donnell et al., 2012). A level of perspective has adopted to identify the stages of developing leader-member exchange theory, and it encapsulates the literature of the LMX within four stages (Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1995):

i) In the first stage, the discovery of differentiated pairs is being implemented, which is the leader domain.

ii) The second stage focuses on the relationship and its outcomes.

iii) The third stage has its focus describing the pairs and building partnership.

iv) The fourth has its focus on the expansion of the pair's partnership to group and network levels.

**Figure 3.** Stages in development of LMX Theory from Graen and Uhl-Bien., 1995.
2.4 Delegation

Delegation has defined as “giving subordinates responsibility for decisions formerly handled by the manager and increasing the amount of latitude and discretion” (Yukl and Fu, 1999). Delegation is not a separate variable, it more of a question how a significant amount of responsibility is being delegated (Drescher, 2017). Besides, delegation does not only have importance for the sake of team efficiency but also for the leaders (Drescher, 2017). By assigning purposeful responsibilities and granting employees with the power to make decisions, the leaders can recognise employees' abilities and thereby increase their popularity and likeability among their employees (House et al, 1971). Differencing styles of leadership also influence the outcomes of delegation in specific task circumstances. Transformational and transactional leadership styles have been compared in individual and team task conditions (Jung and Avolio, 1999). Different leadership styles influence individualists and collectivists executing a brainstorming tasks (Jung and Avolio, 1999). It has also been found that delegation positively influences employees’ overall performance and state of being satisfied with their job (Chen and Arvees, 2007) as well as motivate them (Zhang et al., 2009). The delegation also increases the feeling of being part of the group, being the member and that is related to job satisfaction (Chen and Arvees, 2007).
3 METHODOLOGY

This chapter gives an understanding of the framework of the thesis and explains the methodological approaches that are implemented. First, the research approach that has been chosen is demonstrated. Afterwards, an overview of the data collection for the theoretical framework is being described and also the way the empirical data has been collected. Furthermore, the reliability of this study is being discussed and eventually the connections between the theoretical framework and the research questions of this study.

3.1 Research approach

When we talk about research, we must also speak about deductive and inductive methods. Deductive approach is characterized by placing first attention on theories that already exist and based on that researchers would implement observations and later conclusions (Bryman and Bell, 2003). When it comes to inductive approach, first the observations are carried out and then possible new theories would grow out of them (Bryman and Bell, 2003). Another important matter in research approach is to keep in mind if the study that has been conducted has positivistic or hermeneutic paradigms taken into consideration. Paradigm is a bundle of beliefs or understandings that edict in what direction the study should have, how it should be done (Bryman and Bell, 2003). For positivistic paradigm, the mainly essential element is the truth, and the actual significance of the study do not play that much of a high role (Bryman and Bell, 2003). On the other hand, hermeneutic paradigm takes into consideration the importance of the study, focuses on opinions and attitudes (Bryman and Bell, 2003).

It is important to understand these different approaches and ways of viewing and interpreting in order to decide what kind of research approach a study is going to have. Furthermore, in order to understand research problem on a greater scale, a theoretical framework has been built. The theoretical framework included understanding leadership, the meaning of cultural differences, exploring leader-member exchange and delegation. When the theoretical base had been created, then the new finding of this study would add new value to the theoretical approaches that have been in use before.

As this study aims to dive into the world of academia that is rather most of the times in the shoes of the researcher and not that often the object or subject of the research and also, as the study focuses on social aspects and perspectives that in their nature are constantly changing, this study...
could take an inductive approach through what possible new fundamental values can be recognized. But on the other hand, this study also relates to the theories that have been recognized before and therefore this study also has a deductive nature. As this study caries a nature from both kind of approaches, an abductive approach is being chosen for implementing this study. Abductive approach is considered to be suitable in a situation where one can analyze empirical findings with theories created before and also further re-evaluate the both theories and findings (Alvesson and Sköldberg, 2017). Furthermore, as this study is approaching towards new underlying discoveries in order to understand leadership perception among the members of the faculty in two universities in two completely different countries, it takes in consideration a hermeneutic paradigm when building this research.

### 3.2 Research design

This chapter focuses on the strategy of the research, time horizon, data collection, selection of the institution, selection of the respondents, how the interviews are being conducted and on the process of analysing data. Articulating about previously mentioned subjects is essential in order to build research questions into a full research project (Sekaran, 2016). This chapter will specify the approach of this study and how it has been implemented. The following figure gives a short overview of the methodological details of the study and is being explained further on.

**Figure 4. Elements of research design (Sekaran, 2016)**
3.3 Research strategy

Research can be either quantitative or qualitative. Quantitative research normally involves having a broad collection of data that has been gathered during a longitudinal time and therefore has a very wide amount of perspectives and values from a huge population that needs to be generalised (Bryman and Bell, 2003). Qualitative research, on the other hand, is most of the times cross-sectional when it comes to time horizon and is more interested in exploring and understanding how different processes are going on (Bryman and Bell, 2003). Everything in a quantitative study is subjective and highly depends on the nature of the data.

As this study has been conducted in cross-sectional time horizon (read more in the time horizon section) and the study places its focus on understanding the leadership and delegation perceptions from the point of view of the respondents it takes qualitative research strategy. A qualitative strategy is also suitable for this study as the main way of collecting data is through structured interviews.

3.4 Time horizon

As this study has been carried out during a time constraint of four months, it is considered rather short than long. And also, this study focuses on perceptions of leadership and delegation in order to be able to compare them between two universities, it does not demand longitudinal time horizon. Therefore, this study is having a cross-sectional time horizon.

3.5 Secondary data collection

When we talk about data collection we need to understand the differences between the primary and secondary data. The primary data refers to the data or information that is collected by the researcher, and the secondary data refers to the data that is being gathered from already exciting sources (Sekaran, 2016). Secondary data was collected for this study in order to understand the basic fundamental perception of leadership, cultural differences, LMX and delegation. For gathering this data, mainly the “Web of Science” was used. Main keywords used in the process of looking for the secondary data, in the beginning, were “leadership; employees and leadership” as in the beginning stage of the study there was a general idea that it would be interesting to study leadership and it would be interesting to study how leadership is actually being implemented. Further on, after reading different scientific articles, a more suitable selection of keywords was used to find more relevant data, as the direction of the study had become clearer. Following
keywords were used: "leadership; culture; delegation; leadership perception; organisational behaviour; leadership Pakistan; Pakistan; Sweden leadership; Sweden; transformational leadership". After reading the relevant literature, (around 70 scientific articles) final selection was made, and the choice was cut down to about 50 scientific articles on which this study has built its theoretical framework.

3.6 Empirical data collection

The empirical data of this study has been collected through structured interviews. The data had been obtained from Sweden and Pakistan. There were two layers of the empirical data. First, the head of the IT departments in Sweden and in Pakistan were interviewed in order to understand their perception about their own leadership and delegation. Secondly, the members of the faculty who directly respond to the head of the IT departments were interviewed for understanding their perception of the leadership and delegation of the head of the IT department. Following figure 5 represents the way data is being collected from head of the IT departments (perception 1) and then compared to the perception of the members of the faculty (perception 2) that work under the head of the department interviewed. After that, similarities and differences from two different viewpoints are being compared.

![Figure 5. Layers of the data collection](image)

3.7 Institution selection

As in general, there is already a lot knowledge about the way how leadership and delegation might be in private companies perceived, and not that much studies are done that try to focus on how leadership and delegation might be perceived in academic context, the author of this study has found it interesting to explore how it might be perceived in universities. The institutions or the universities being under the headlight of this study, are being selected based on their geographical and cultural distance from each other and also based on the accessibility. As the university located
in Sweden is the nearest university for the conductor of this study it is reliable to choose a university for the selection that comes from similar environmental setting with the researcher. University taken under view in Pakistan is located in the capital of Pakistan, Islamabad. Because it is located in the capital and therefore it is more easily accessible, this particular university has been chosen. Another aspect is that the university chosen in Pakistan is one of the well know universities in Pakistan and therefore caught greater attention. Institution selection also consisted the process of contacting the IT departments in both universities and convincing them about the importance of this study and how it could be useful for them.

3.8 Respondent selection

The selection of the respondents plays a significant importance in order to establish finding the answers to the research question that have been described in the introduction section of this study. To have right people responding to make reliable conclusions is essential. Similarly, to the selection process of the institution, the selection of the respondents is based mostly on the accessibility. Most of the members of the faculty in all the universities are often busy, and therefore it can be difficult to approach them during the time constraint that has been given for this study. Therefore, some of the personal contacts are being used in order to get a stronger access to the members of the faculty in the IT department in both universities. In total 12 respondents have been selected for this study, from both of the universities equally six respondents. Most of the respondents happened to be male, but from both universities, one female respondent was selected. The lack of equality in the gender selection is due to the field that often, in general, is lacking female workforce. Mostly men study and work in the area of IT and technology, it is not that popular among women. The selection of the universities and the departments in both Sweden and Pakistan was based on the fact that people are working in Swedish university or Pakistani university. Therefore, respondents from the Swedish university happened to not be from Sweden, but from different countries around the world. Even though the respondents from Sweden are not born as Swedes, the respondents from Swedish university have a long experience in living in Sweden, for example, the head of the department has Swedish citizenship and has lived in Sweden from 1992. Similarly, other respondents have studied or lived in Sweden for a more extended period and like the head of the department in Sweden, managed to adapt to Swedish way of life and adapted to Swedish culture, and some have taken Swedish citizenship. Respondents from the university in Pakistan were all Pakistani nationalities. The age of the respondents varies from 28
years to 66, and the length of working at the current workplace also varied from one year to seven years as it is also visible from the table 1, that gives the overview of the respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SWEDEN</th>
<th>PAKISTAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondent</strong></td>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject 1 HD</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject 2</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject 3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject 4</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject 5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject 6</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Overview of the respondents

3.9 Interviews

The interviews were conducted with the head of the IT departments in Sweden and in Pakistan. Similarly, interviews with the members of the faculty who respond to both of the head of the department were interviewed for developing an understanding of the differences and similarities from different perfectives. The length of the interviews was in average for 40 minutes. In total 12 interviews were done in order to collect data for this study. The interviews were structured as it is known for this research what kind of information is needed in order to fulfil the aim of this study. The interviewer had beforehand prepared questions that were asked from the respondents. Mainly the questions (See Appendix C and D) focused on how they perceive leadership and delegation or how the head of the IT departments envoy from their own perspective leadership and delegation. The questions were designed in a way that the respondents would have to emphasize multiple times on the same matter but from a different angle to get maximum explanations from the respondents. According to the aspects that might have come up during the discussions, the respondents were asked to respond to additional questions. The following are main interview questions used to collect data for this study:

(1) Have you faced any misunderstandings with your leader? Explain, describe the misunderstandings.

(2) How do you see your leader? Describe him or her and his or her leadership style.

(3) How would you expect your leader to lead?
(4) What means good leadership to you?
(5) How do you receive tasks from your leader?
(6) In what extent do you receive high responsibility tasks?
(7) Do you feel trusted by the head of the department?
(8) What has been the main reason for misunderstanding the task that has been given?

3.10 Data analysis procedures

In order to analyze the data that has been collected, the interviews were recorded and afterwards fully transcribed in written form. As the interviews were conducted in English the transcripts of the interviews were also written in English. An inductive approach for the data analysis has been taken in consideration and therefore the study relies on inductive reasoning. After the process of transcribing the data that has been recorded, the process of dividing data into different categories’ or groups has been implemented and after that step by step reducing the number of categories into much broader categories have been carried out. This process helps to generate a greater understanding and knowledge about the data. Further, the goodness of the data is being viewed to see if further investigations would be necessary to answer the research questions developed for this study (Sekaran, 2016). The analysis of this study involves comparing the perceptions of the head of the departments and their employee's perceptions both in Sweden and Pakistan separately. Afterwards, the perceptions of both countries are being compared to each other. Eventually, the results from both countries are being compared to the theoretical understandings. Finally, the research question is being answered, conclusions are made, and further implications of the study have been presented.

3.11 Credibility of the study

The central credibility of this study comes from the fact that empirical data has been collected from structured interviews that represent strongly the perspectives of the respondents. The research question of this study was not presented to the respondents in order to avoid that the questions might have some sort of influence on the answers that the respondents gave. Therefore, biases in this study were avoided as much as possible.
3.12 Reliability
In order to make sure that the qualitative findings of this study are reliable, the interviews with each respondent were recorded and afterwards transcribed entirely. After that, the transcripts were analysed by comparing the results with previous studies. Also, in order to make sure that the respondents would not illustrate their answers into a more nicer form, the interview questions emphasised multiple times on similar matter, but from a different angle.

3.13 Research ethics
In the beginning of each interview from each participant was asked if he or she agrees with being recorded. Afterwards, each respondent is safe from displaying their actual name in this study. Each respondent is being approached in this study by being study subject (for example Subject no. 1, Subject no. 2 etc.). Because the respondents asked for being anonymous the names of the departments and the University will also be kept anonymous in this study.

3.14 Operationalization
As this study aims to investigate leadership and delegation perceptions through the eyes of the members of the faculty in the IT departments in both universities and at the same time this study also dives into discovering how the head of the IT departments in both universities perceive their own leadership and delegation it is essential to understand basic views about leadership. This study is a cross-cultural comparative study and therefore understanding views towards cultural differences is mandatory in order to compare two countries and their academic environments. As this study puts strong emphases on understanding the relationship between the “leader and employee”, understanding LMX and delegation are essential. This study is built on by taking in consideration what views there have been before when conceptualising leadership, cultural differences and delegation and investigates how it is carried out in academia as the work nature in academia tends to differ from companies.
4 EMPIRICAL DATA

This chapter gives a short overview of the data that has been gathered during this study. In the beginning, an overview of the characteristics of the respondents is given and afterwards short description of the data representing the head of the departments both from Sweden and Pakistan is presented. Data concerning the employees in both departments is presented as for the head of departments, but in-depth presentation with categorisations of the data is available in the appendixes A and B of this study.

The empirical data for this study was gathered through structured interviews with the members of the faculty from the university in Sweden and from the University in Pakistan, Islamabad. From both universities, the head of the departments (HD) gave an interview regarding their perception of their own leadership and delegation, and from both of the universities, five members of the faculty shared their views and perception of the leadership and delegation that they receive while working under the head of the department. In total there were 12 interviews conducted in order to gather data for this study. Most of the respondents were men, from both of the universities there was only one woman interviewed i.e. one from each university. The time period in which respondents have worked at their current workplace varied, both in Pakistan and in Sweden from one to seven years. Most of the respondents have received their education or work experience from countries that differ from their home countries. Table 2 gives an overview of the countries where the respondents have received their education or worked.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Education or work in a foreign country</th>
<th>Study Subject</th>
<th>Education or work in a foreign country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject 1 HD</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Subject 1 HD</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject 2</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Subject 2</td>
<td>Japan, Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject 3</td>
<td>France, UK, Spain</td>
<td>Subject 3</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject 4</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>Subject 4</td>
<td>USA, Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject 5</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Subject 5</td>
<td>France, Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject 6</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Subject 6</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Overview of the respondents educational or work experience in foreign countries.
4.1 Data concerning the university from Sweden

The age of the respondents varied in Sweden from 31 to 66 years. The respondents from Swedish university were from different countries, and eventually, none of them was born as Swede. The respondents often had started working as a postdoctoral researcher in the beginning in the case of Sweden university and then further climbed further to an assistant professor position.

4.2 Leadership, views of the head of the department

When it comes to the perception of leadership and delegation in the university in Sweden, the first overview of the perception of the head of the department about his own leadership should be given. When it comes to describing leadership, the head of the department found it important to understand what is going on in the department, also to know people and in what they are good at, have strategic directions and also having the ability to work together as an important component of leadership. The head of the department thought that he is easily approachable and the way he thinks that he has made himself easily approachable is through conversations in the beginning whenever a new employee is being hired, also by encouraging people to talk about everything they wish during weekly meetings; also, through traditional breakfast that is held every Tuesday before the weekly meeting. As a leader, the head of the department found himself to be easy going and easily approachable, also he always tries to be available to solve any problems that the employees might be facing. He also thinks that he listens to people and their opinions. When describing good leadership, the head of the department pointed out that listening to people and creating the feeling that as a leader you serve your employees is important. Also having a general overview of all the changes and directions is important in order to be a good leader. Putting one's needs before the needs of the department and not having a general overview was described as a lousy leadership by the head of the department. When asked what the head of the department does to be a good leader, he was somewhat confused as in general he does not view himself as a leader, instead of as a colleague. The head of the department feels confident in his role as he has been working at the university for a longer period. As the main strength as a leader, the head of the department pointed out that he listens to people and makes them feel that he is there for the employees and also that he is aware of what the people in his department are doing. He did not point out any of his weaknesses as a leader. In general, the head of the department aims as a leader to have a good working environment, so that people feel comfortable and want to come to work every day. Also, he finds it important to work on career development of the younger researchers and make sure that the students in the university receive a proper education.
4.3 Delegation, views of the head of the department

When it comes to the discussion about delegation, the head of the department thought he does not need a constant overview of what his employees are doing. The main communication is done verbally or by e-mail, but the head of the department mainly prefers to use verbal way of communicating. The head of the department trusts his employees and pointed out that he relies on them 100%. The best way to communicate tasks clearly is through discussion and therefore the head of the department does not think that there has been much miscommunication. In general, he thought that misunderstandings can be good as they can be eye openers and let you see a different point of views. On daily basis he does not keep a record what everyone is doing, he likes to give freedom to his employees. When it comes to expressing that he is satisfied with the work that has been done, he expresses it directly by saying face to face or also during the department meetings in front of everyone.

4.4 Leadership and delegation, views of the faculty

When it comes to the views and understandings of the members of the faculty working under the head of the department, a table has been constructed in order to have an overall view of the main points that are highlighted by the respondents (See Appendix A). From the table, it can be seen that most of the respondents find the head of the department to be openminded, easily approachable and having excellent communication skills. Findings also indicate that the head of the department is being viewed confident in his role as the head of the department.

4.5 Data concerning the university from Pakistan

The age of the respondent varied from 28 years to 36 years in Pakistan. The respondents from Pakistan were all Pakistani nationals. In the case of the university in Pakistan, the respondents who had not worked for a significant amount of time at their current workplace had had an interaction with their head of the department in the past, or they had been studying in the same university beforehand and had experienced supervision by the head of the department. So, therefore the respondents already knew the head of the department for a significant amount of time and had a good idea and practical experience about his way of leading and delegating.
4.6 Leadership, views of the head of the department

The data gathered from the head of the department from the university in Pakistan was very insightful, and a lot of information was collected. When it comes to describing leadership, the head of the department found it essential to have people following the leader with their hearts and also highlighted that it is essential to be true to your vision. The head of the department finds his leadership to be very good and successful, and he thinks that he is approachable and friendly. Good leadership means to him having followers who believe in the same cause, being open to the opinions of the followers and making the followers to connect to the leader emotionally. Bad leadership was described by not connecting with one's followers, not having the vision or idea of the direction where you are going and also not having the correct vision. The head of the department in Pakistani university feels very confident in his role and he pointed out three strengths of his leadership: i) sincerity for the cause; ii) sincerity for the team and iii) excellent ability to communicate. When asked about weaknesses he pointed out that sometimes as a human one wants to have fun and that can be misleading from the direction where you are heading. His goal is to work on making the department extraordinary and also to have input in reaching with his university or some other university among top 100 universities in the world. He thinks that people are happy with his leadership mainly because all the success that he has been experiencing.

4.7 Delegation, views of the head of the department

When it comes to discussing about delegation, the head of the department thinks that his employees some guidance, but not in everything. The main communication is done verbally or by e-mail or phone. He prefers to give tasks verbally and the task is distributed by the nature of the task and the capabilities of the employees fitting together. He thinks that he does give high responsibility tasks as he finds it important to see the good in the people and as he likes to see what kind of tasks the employees can handle. He has trust in his employees. The main aspect of the tasks to be communicated clearly is that it should not be forced on and it should be communicated openly. General misunderstandings have not occurred but there has been an ethical problem in the department in the past. The head of the department finds misunderstandings to be bad. When asked about the need to have a constant overview of the things that are happening in the department, the head of the department thinks that it is good to have overview. The head of the department expresses his satisfaction or dissatisfaction about the work outcomes mostly through facial expressions.
4.8 Leadership and delegation, views of the faculty

When it comes to the views and understandings of the members of the faculty working under the head of the department, a table has been constructed in order to have an overall view of the main points that are highlighted by the respondents (See Appendix B). Mainly the respondents find the head of the department to be approachable and a good leader. Also, the ability to communicate well is being pointed out mutually by the respondents. Findings also show that the respondents think that the head of the department feels confident in his role as the head of the department.
5 ANALYSIS

This chapter will analyse the data that has been collected while implementing this study. The quotations in the analysis are taken from the transcripts of the interviews. This chapter also seeks an answer to the research question that has been discussed earlier in the introduction chapter of this study. Firstly, the perception of leadership and delegation in Sweden is being viewed, after that leadership and delegation in Pakistan is being viewed. Finally, perceptions from both countries are being compared to seek answers to the research question of this study.

5.1 Leadership perception in Sweden

When asked from the members of the faculty what describes leadership, main aspects that were pointed out are: i) having a clear vision; ii) motivating; iii) having empathy iv) being an example to your followers and v) working together. Findings in Sweden go along with the leadership aspects described in the theoretical framework section of this study where it has been stated that leadership consists of variety of skills like influencing goals of the tasks, interpersonal and also persuasive skills (Yusof et al., 2014), and also Waldman and others have stated that leaders motivate and have emotional appeal (Waldman et al., 2006). For example, subject no. 4 from Sweden has emphasised that: “To be a leader you have to be a role model for your subordinates. It is more about managing an organisation and the leader is one who is very hard working and who has a vision and then he gets good guidelines that he gives to his subordinates to achieve the objective of the organisation, the prime objective. And obviously we are working under the umbrella of objectives that are being provided to us.” It means that leadership is being viewed as something that gives one support in order to implement one’s work. From the side of the head of the department form Sweden, opinion about leadership is more in relation with having an overview and knowing people: “I think you have to have a very good understanding of what is going on in the department. And then also it is important to know people and in what they are good at. Some people, they like doing more teaching, others like doing more research and we want them to be involved in both teaching and education.” But on the other hand, the head of the departments view about teamwork seems to be similar with the respondents working under him: “I think of course you have to work together, you are not able to do just on your own to solve those tasks. It is just teamwork.” Therefore, it can be said that leadership in general in the university from Sweden is associated with:

i) having teamwork;

ii) having a clear vision;

iii) working hard;
iv) being an example in front of the followers;
v) having an overview of what is going on;
vi) knowing people;
vii) motivating;
viii) having empathy.

When it comes to the understanding of good leadership in general, it is being pointed out that being supportive, working towards the aim or goal and being easy to talk with are important. These are similar to what had been pointed out while describing leadership in general by the respondents from Sweden. Also, as it has been discussed in the theory section of this study that the relationship that is built on trust and engagement are considered to have characteristics of a transformational leadership approach (Jung and Avolio, 1999) and therefore, it could be stated that according to the perceptions in academia in Sweden, it is preferred to have transformational leadership style. The main aspects of bad leadership, on the other hand, is being described as a situation where the aims are not being achieved and also by someone who demands results without contributing in it or having a vision. Subject no. 4 has explained it as follows: “The bad leader is the one who does not have a vision, first of all, he is more like delegating the task to the employees without having any vision and that is why it may result in mismanagement. It may result in putting more load, overloading the employees with the task and work, and also he won’t be able to produce results.”

The head of the department has also pointed out that not taking in consideration the needs of the department first and not having the overview of the things that are going on in the department: “I think that when you put your own needs before the department needs or school needs. So, then it is that if your needs are first, before the department I think people would notice very easily this after some time. And this creates a bad environment. If you do not have this general image, a pattern so, foresee the future, so then it could be hard for the department.” Therefore, it could be concluded that bad leadership is associated with:

i) being selfish;
ii) demanding more than the employees can deliver;
iii) not having results;
iv) not knowing what is going on in the department, what people are doing;
v) not knowing where you are going, what is your aim.

### 5.1.1 Leadership in the department

The leadership in the department is mainly being described as very open, encouraging and supportive. This strongly relates to the theoretical understandings that state that leader is someone
who creates high extent of motivation, confidence, reliance and emotional appeal (Waldman et al., 2006; Shamir et al., 1993). For example, subject no. 5 has pointed out that the head of the department always listens to everyone's opinions: "Here I think it is more open for discussions, for example when there is a decision to take in the lab that concerns people working here, then usually the head of the department asks about this during the lab meeting and he really takes the opinion of the people there. He listens and tries to take into count what you suggest." Also, subject no. 3 has pointed out similarly that the head of the department is very open for discussions and also that he acts immediately when something is requested from him: “I can immediately go to him, he is easy to talk with and when I have a request or something he follows after request, I am really happy with that." The head of the department has emphasised that he finds himself as a leader to be opened and a problem solver: “I hope that others think that I am easy going. That they can always approach me and discuss. I try to solve all these problems or tasks as soon as possible if there are any problems to be solved, so I do not wait. So usually I just take and do that - since you have to do it anyway.” This means that the way head of the department views himself as a leader and the way people working under him or responding to him view him is the same way. That indicates also that the head of the department has honestly evaluated himself during the data collection process and also that the head of the department has achieved to be a leader who he thinks he is in practice. The head of the department is being found to be approachable without any hesitation by all of the respondents. Subject no. 6 has also mentioned that the head of the department keeps his door opened when he is available: “He is very approachable and one good thing that he does that he leaves his door opened when he is available.” Subject no. 2, on the other hand, did point out that sometimes he tends to be more careful when approaching the head of the department: “I think he does awesome job, but I think in any situation when you talk to someone who has power over what will happen, you have to be a little bit careful.” The head of the department himself finds him to be approachable and open to any discussions. It has been said that the way leader behaves, has great impact on the efficiency of the employees (Banai and Reisel, 2007) - the way head of the department has acted in order to have an open environment has definitely had strong impact, as being more open and approachable has certainly speed up many processes in the department. This way people in the department don’t spend time on hesitation to approach him – they just do it when needed. His main method for creating an opened environment is by encouraging people to talk and also through weekly breakfast before the meeting where people can have fun get together. He emphasises that: “My door is opened, I think that they do not hesitate to come and talk when they have any questions. We have these weekly department meetings and I encourage people to be very opened and talk about everything they like. I don’t think that
there is someone who hesitates to come in and ask any questions. I hope that. And also, we have this breakfast, traditional breakfast, to start our meetings there is breakfast - it is on Tuesdays.” In general, the view from the head of the departments point of view and the feeling from the people responding to him seems to be similar. The head of the department is found to be easily approachable and encouraging. Also, all the respondents think that the head of the department feels confident in his role and this opinion goes together with the actual feeling of the head of the department. This indicates that the head of the department has succeeded in presenting or generating an overall understanding about his accessibility and openness into practice. His perception about himself is being recognised by others in reality. Leadership described in this section also goes together with the literature that states that Swedish organisations are considered to be more horizontal and because of that much more open for the opinions of the employees (Zabihi, 2013).

5.1.2 Strengths of the head of the department

The head of the department in the university in Sweden is being viewed as someone who has excellent communications skills and another strength that has been pointed out is that he works really hard. A good example is an emphasis on the subject no. 2: “He is working really hard, the second thing is that he is really a good researcher, he probably publishes a huge amount.” Another thing that is being mentioned by subject no. 5 is that the head of the department does not seem to be level higher, he is being sensed and viewed as a colleague: “I don’t feel that I need to prepare things before talking to him, I just go and talk. I feel that he is not my boss, he is like a colleague.” The head of the department himself has pointed out as main strengths that he listens to people, has good overview and makes everyone feel that he is there to serve the people not the other way around: “I think listening to people and making them feel that you are for them, I think it is a strength. If people notice that you have a excellent knowledge and you know why you make and can motivate those decisions I think also this is a strength. If you are aware of what is going on, why you take such a decision then is also a strength, you can always motivate, argue that is was the right thing to do.” As discussed in the theory section that there are three approaches towards leadership style, and when looking at the leadership of the head of the department in Sweden, it appears that the third domain approach seems to be in practice when it comes to academia in Sweden, and that is being follower-based, that mainly focuses on the aspects that are in relation with followers (Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1995). It seems that the head of the department has succeeded in making the members of the faculty who respond to him feel that he is always there when they
need him, and therefore they feel the freedom while working under him. He is being looked up for his experience and knowledge that he has gained after many years of doing research and being part of the academia. Mostly the views about the strengths of the head of the department match with the view of the head of the department about himself. Again, it indicates that he has been quite transparent as a leader.

5.1.3 Weaknesses of the head of the department
The head of the department has personally not pointed out any of his shortcomings, but there seems to be a generally same opinion among all the members of the faculty, that he, in fact, has one weak point and that involves explaining or giving background information about the assignments that he provides. Subject no. 5 has emphasised for example: "It is one weakness actually, if the head of the department comes actually, when he suggests you do something, for example, usually it is about writing proposals to get funding, then he does not give much details in the beginning. So, he just throws this question: can you look at this and see if you can work on it and do something with it."

Another weakness that was pointed out by one of the respondents is that when there are meetings held and some matters are being discussed, it could happen that some issues have not been concluded, and they keep being discussed every week during the meeting: “For example the new name of the lab was being discussed throughout several meetings and several weeks without any consensus. Sometimes I think that we could be doing something else.” As the head of the department did not really point out himself any of his weaknesses it is not possible to say if the views of others go together with his image. Sometimes it is also difficult to see your own weaknesses or things in what you could improve. Theory also says that people don’t emphasize on their weaknesses as they find weaknesses to be something that can be improved over time and strengths something that they think that are going to stay there forever, and therefore, they have more certainty in their mind when they talk about strengths (Steimer and Mata, 2016). Having some of the weaknesses gives a healthy impression about the leadership, because when everything would be described as ideal by the members of the faculty, who respond to the head of the department, it could indicate that maybe the head of the department is being idealised. Having pointed out some weaknesses means that the respondents have been honest while contributing to this study and that as a leader the head of the department has room for improvements.

5.2 Delegation perception in Sweden
When it comes to need for guidance it has been pointed out by some of the respondents that they need somewhat guidance with administrative issues or that they expect somewhat mentorship from
the head of the department, as it also has been pointed out by the subject no. 4: “He is more experienced, and he is a professor and he has spent his lifetime in academia and we as a junior researchers or assistant professors we need to follow his steps to reach to that level to promote ourselves and to learn more and that is why we need guidance.” But in general, there does not seem to be a strong need for the guidance by the head of the department. Similarly, the head of the department feels that he does not need to guide the members of the faculty on daily basis: “They perhaps need to some kind of guidance in the beginning how it works, how the department works and how the school works and the general guidance concerning their own engagement in different processes. But if you think about those who have been employed longer time I don’t think that they need or expect some guidance from me.” This again shows that there is a good general understanding of what expectations on both sides might be, and how the head of the department understands the needs of his employees. The main way of communication in the department is through e-mails or by face to face talking and also when it comes to delegating tasks, the head of the department finds it most convenient to just go and discuss about the task that he wants someone to implement: “I prefer talking to people. It is easier to have discussions, to look in the eye and then convince and get a feeling how the person feels about this.” Similarly, the members of the faculty sense that mostly the tasks are being distributed through verbal interaction: “When he asks me to just look at something he usually just comes and talks to me.” The head of the department relies completely on the employees of the department and has full trust in them: “I rely on them 100%. I know that they are good in what they are doing, and I rely on them.” All of the employee’s sense that they are being trusted, like for example subject no. 3 has emphasised: “My feeling is that they know what I can do and usually when they assign a task they know that I can do it.” As mentioned before the leadership in Sweden is being evaluated as a good leadership and the members of the faculty do not seem to have problems with the head of the department – that could be because the employees feel trusted. Like discussed in the theoretical framework of this study where it states that when leaders give purposeful responsibilities, it means employees feel trusted, then the likeability of a leader increases (House et al, 1971). None of the respondents has faced misunderstandings with the head of the department. Similarly, the head of the department has not, from his point of view, had any misunderstanding with the members of the faculty. Mainly he has emphasized that he always discusses and therefore misunderstanding don’t occur, and discussion will continue until everything is clear: “I don’t think we have misunderstandings because we always talk it through.” The head of the department does not find it necessary to have a constant overview in daily basics about what everyone is doing in the department and similarly, the employees do not see it to be necessary. Again, from comparing both sides, it seems that the way
the head of the department thinks about himself and how he might be visible in practice to others seems very close to reality. People feel that mainly he is there for support but do not expect continuous guidance from him, they feel trusted and they feel that misunderstanding to not occur as everything is always been discussed through. That in some way prevents misunderstandings. The head of the department is being liked by the respondents and that could be due to the fact that he gives responsibility and freedom to his employees. Also, it has been stated that delegating tasks has influence on overall performance and being satisfied with job and it also increases feeling of being part of the group (Chen and Arvees, 2007). This is another aspect that gives reason why the members of the faculty in Sweden are satisfied and happy with the leadership of the head of the department.

5.3 Leadership and delegation perception in general in Sweden

In general, it seems that the head of the department in the university from Sweden has succeeded in giving an understanding of himself and his expectations to his followers. The members of the faculty all seem to talk in same language and have same understanding about him. This indicates that the head of the department has been successful in communicating messages and expressing himself. Overall understanding about what leadership is that it is associated with having teamwork, having a clear vision, working hard, being an example, having an overview about what is going on, knowing people, having empathy and motivating. The members of the faculty from the university in Sweden do not expect daily guidance from the head of the department, and they feel that they have freedom, the level of trust is high. When one feels trusted, he feels more motivated and openminded in fulfilling his or her work. Similarly, it has been suggested by Drescher, that the likeability of the leader mediates a positive interconnection between the delegation and satisfaction of the employee and also the way they discern leaders performance (Drescher, 2017). Tasks are rather suggested than forced on the respondents and mainly everything is being elaborated through discussions.

5.4 Leadership perception in Pakistan

When it comes to the perceptions of the members of the faculty about the leadership in general, it is that leader should set an example, recognize the abilities and potential of the employees, guide towards the aim and give feedback. Just like it is the case in Sweden, as stated in section 5.1 and also in the theoretical framework of this study it has been pointed out that leadership consists of a collection of skills like for example influencing goals of the tasks, interpersonal and also persuasive skills (Yusof et al., 2014). Waldman and others have also emphasised that leaders
motivate and have emotional appeal (Waldman et al., 2006). Like, for example, the subject no. 3 has emphasised: “I guess leadership is recognizing the potential of your team, their interests and strengths and align them to achieve the goals of the institution as well as their individual goals in their lives.” Or also the opinion of the subject no. 5 who places more strength on teamwork and distributing work: "I think a leader is a person who can do teamwork first of all. Second who is able to distribute work properly among the team and get good feedback maybe, so knows his or her proper goals and knows how to achieve them.” This means that the members of the faculty in the university in Pakistan find it important to have great team dynamics and feeling that they are being appreciated as a valuable member of the team, also having a clear vision in front of you. One way to establish great team dynamics definitely is through delegating tasks (Chen and Arvees, 2007). The head of the department has found it important that people follow the leader through their hearts, and never losing track of one’s aim and purpose: "So from my point of view the crux of the leadership is that people should follow you with their hearts. It should not be forced upon them that they are bound to follow you. For that, you have to be true to your field, true to your vision.” Therefore, it can be said that leadership in general in the university from Pakistan is associated with:

i) Being an example;
ii) Guiding employees towards the goals;
iii) Recognising the abilities and potential of the employees;
iv) Giving feedback to the employees;
v) Being true to your vision and aim;
vi) Having people following you from their hearts.

Good leadership is being viewed as something that associates with taking initiative, being flexible or open-minded, inspiring people and keeping people involved. This is something that also is mentioned in the theory section of this study, where it is stated that exceptional leaders communicate a vision that has strong ideological standards and a solid imagery and also, they influence thinking that created new solutions that are innovative (Waldman et al., 2006; Shamir et al., 1993). Also, it has been pointed out also by the subject no. 4: “A good leadership means that the leader should keep the persons involved with him together. And he should keep them motivated so that they can work together or individually to achieve a better outcome.” It is also suggested that the leaders who create an understanding why it When it comes to bad leadership and giving labels on it, mainly it has been stated that it involves someone who is simply bossy and does not really get involved him or herself, or also someone who does not listen to you. Subject no. 6 has strongly emphasised on that: “I think that if a person would actually just delegate the
responsibilities, they would just simply say that do this and do that. And not actually getting involved, not taking any liabilities, I think that would be a really bad model for leadership.” The head of the department has pointed out that not knowing what is going on in the field and also in the world describes a bad leader and also having no connection with the employees: "In my opinion, a bad leadership would be the failure to connect to the people that you are leading." Therefore, it could be concluded that bad leadership is in connection with dictating tasks without having own input, thus not connecting with the employees, and because of not having connection also not having a knowledge of what is going on.

5.4.1 Leadership in the department
In general, the members of the faculty find the leadership of the head of the department to be good and effective. One of the respondents have described his leadership as follows: "He is a very enthusiastic person, he has a lot of ideas, and he is working day and night to achieve those goals. So, he is pretty much motivated. He did his PhD from Japan, so he works like Japanese people. So, he works day and night, and he tries to keep people in the department together and work in that direction to achieve some proper ideas and research goals. So, his leadership is quite good.” Also, the head of the department is being described as being friendly and easily approachable like it has also been described by the subject no. 5: “There are no boundaries and no timings and nothing, we can approach whenever we want to. We can just walk into his office.” This indicates that there are signs of being a transformational leader, like it has been stated that when it comes to transformational leadership, there is much more closer relationship between the follower and leader and the relationship is mainly based on engagement and trust (Jung and Avolio, 1999). Everyone finds the head of the department to be confident in his role as the head of the department and also the head of the department himself has pointed out that he feels confident. He also has emphasised that all the members of his team can approach him freely and that he even considers them more like friends than colleagues or employees: “I think relationship building is very critical. That’s what I do with most of my employees, with most of my employees I have a very friendly relationship. I consider them my friends rather than people who are working for me.” Again, theory also suggest that leaders should be having a selection of skills to in order to put strategies and goals into actions, like influencing task goals and having interpersonal and persuasive skills (Yusof et al., 2014). As the general understanding and feeling seem to be similar, that the leadership of the head of the department is good and that he is really easily approachable without any boundaries, it can be stated that the leadership is being carried out well. Also, because the views of the members of the faculty seem to go together with the views of the head of the department
about his own leadership and approachability, it could be said that the head of the department has done an excellent job in conveying his figure as a leader. This means that the way the head of the department perceives his own leadership and approachability is close to reality that the employees perceive from him.

5.4.2 Strengths of the head of the department

It is being said that if a leader has an ability to guide their followers to see the important and to make them transcend their self-interest for the sake of the vision or mission, then the leader most likely is being transformational (Jung and Avolio, 1999). As main strengths of the head of the department it has been stated that he is an excellent communicator, he is teamwork oriented and, he listens and inspires people – therefore, it could be said that the head of the department in Pakistan has transformational approach. As subject no. 6 has pointed out: “They actually are inspired by the examples that the head of the department gives. People actually do get inspired.” It has also been pointed out that he has great expertise in the field that he is working in. It has been also pointed out that he is very patient: “I would say the strength is flexibility, teamwork, and patience. He is very patient.” The head of the department himself find that having good communication skill has been helpful and finds himself to be sincerely dedicated to the greater cause: “Main strengths are having sincerity to your cause and your team and then the ability to communicate, to understand what the other person is saying and to communicate your own opinion effectively, to know what to say and what not to say. So, these are three things, the sincerity with your cause, sincerity to your team and the ability to communicate.” It can be concluded that the head of the department’s good communication skill has been noticed by the members of the faculty who respond to him and the head of the department at the same time recognises himself that communication is one of his strengths. Other strengths that the members of the faculty had pointed out were not so strongly recognised by the head of the department himself and the strengths that the head of the department pointed out like sincerity to the cause or the team were not that strongly recognised by the members of the faculty. It can be that sometimes people notice more about you than you yourself, because you emphasise on certain things about yourself more than about some other things. In general, the strengths of the head of the department have been recognised and some of the strengths have been pointed out from both sides. This indicates that to some extent the head of the department has succeeded in expressing his strengths to the members of the faculty. So, it can be said that there is transparency in concerning his leadership.
5.4.3 Weaknesses of the head of the department

Three main weaknesses of the head of the department have been pointed out: i) weak time management; ii) being over occupied and iii) talking sometimes too much. Subject no. 2 has emphasised on both, time management and talking much: “Weakness is that he speaks maybe too much sometimes. This is one thing, he has a lot of ideas running through his mind. Time management again I would say is the main weakness that I would highlight.” And similarly, subject no. 5 has explained the issue with being over occupied: “And weaknesses I think he remains so much busy with funding’s and national centres, he is very very occupied, so we have to catch him of phone or something like that. Sometimes we don’t find him on his seat and that because of the lots of responsibilities that he is serving.” When it was asked from the head of the department about his weaknesses, he rather gave a weakness that one could also consider as a strength in some situations. He stated that: “A part of me want to have some fun in life and I think that part is probably my weakness. Because you can’t work like a machine. In leadership the more you can work like a machine and think about leadership, that works. A really true leader would be one whose personal interests are not important to him at all.” This indicates that the weaknesses that the members of the faculty see as weaknesses, and the weaknesses that the head of the department sees as weaknesses are not matching that strongly. It can be because very often we as humans try to hide our weaknesses deep inside in order to seem confident and always on track. Again, as theory suggest that weaknesses are something that we perceive to be changeable over time, and therefore perceive them to be not as permanent as strengths, we don’t emphasise on them that strongly as we perceive them to be temporary (Steimer and Mata, 2016). It can be also that in the moment when the head of the department was interviewed did not feel good about sharing about all the weaknesses that he thinks that he has. Also, sometimes we do not remember all the things that we might want to say in the situation where the information has to be provided. So, there can be several reasons why the views from both sides do not seem to match with each other that strongly. In a situation where, one could assume that the head of the department did share sincerely about his one weakness, that he sometimes wants to have fun, then it could be concluded that the members of the faculty do not recognise similar weaknesses compared to the recognition of the head of the department. The two sides are not having much similarities when it comes to perceiving.

5.5 Delegation perception in Pakistan

When it comes to the perception of guidance in the university in Pakistan, the head of the department emphasised that the members of the faculty do need his guidance depending on the
person’s needs: “They need some guidance, but not all guidance in everything. Everyone is different in this aspect. There are some who I can give a task and am confident that the task will reach completion. But the size of the task has to be limited. Everyone is different in how many people or size of a group they can manage. Some other need more guidance. And this you have to learn from experience. You have to give them a task and let them do it independently and see how the perform.” On the other hand, the members of the faculty seem to be all having the opinion that they do need guidance but mainly when it comes to administrative matters. Subject no. 2 has pretty strongly emphasised how he needs guidance by the head of the department: “Yes definitely, in many of the administrative things I do need his guidance and especially in communication with other departments, communicating with other organisations from outside, or writing proposals. Definitely we need guidance, especially administrative and interacting with other organisations.” Therefore, it could be concluded that both sides have a similar sense about the amount of guidance that is required from the head of the department. The main way of communication in the department is through e-mails or by face-to-face talking and also when it comes to delegating tasks, the head of the department finds it most convenient to just go and discuss the task that he wants someone to implement. Similarly, most of the members of the faculty find that they receive mainly tasks through verbal communication as the subject no. 2 has also pointed out: “Generally if the tasks are very big or medium tasks a meeting is called where we discuss all the things face to face. Otherwise, we discuss on the phone or we exchange notes or some documents over e-mails or Whatsapp.” People in the department feel that they do receive high responsibility tasks and that they are being trusted. It comes back to the similar situation, that has been discussed earlier in the case of Sweden, that if employees feel that they receive responsibilities that are purposeful and that they have power to make decisions, they develop higher likeability towards their leader (House et al., 1971). This indicates again that the feeling of being trusted could be one of the reasons why the leadership of the head of the department is being liked by the members of the faculty in Pakistan. Subject no. 2 has quite strongly emphasised on that matter: “When he is travelling for work or holiday etc. I am acting as the head when he is away so in those times I do pretty much the tasks that he does, so that's quite high responsibility tasks. I still receive high responsibility tasks as he is super busy he delegates many tasks. The most recent situation was when we had to organise a workshop, I was mostly doing it by myself, I got some advice and opinions from him but mostly I organised it alone. We had 20 presenters and 500 people attending.” This means that similarly like in Sweden the likeability is achieved through the feeling of being trusted. No general misunderstandings have been experienced, from both the side of the head of the department and also from the side of the members of the faculty who respond to the head of
the department. When it comes to having a constant overview about the operations that are happening daily, the head of the department finds it good to have an overview: "In the beginning, I didn't require that, but with time I have learned that it's good to have an overview." When the view of the members of the faculty is being viewed, some of them do say that the head of the department has a constant overview and also that they often themselves provide such overview, then main opinion is that the constant overview is not that strongly present, like it has also described by the subject no. 6: “He does not actually ask for a constant overview. He does ask for a periodic overview. He expects me to give him an idea about what I am doing and particularly regarding the tasks that he has assigned to me, he does ask about them from me once per two weeks, but I actually report about my proceedings myself.” As it seems, the perception of delegation seems to be mostly in line from both sides. The members of the faculty find the ways of delegating efficient and they seem to have not experienced any major issues when it comes to understanding the tasks that they have been receiving. The members of the faculty in the department are being trusted and they also in reality sense that the trust from the head of the department does exist. This indicates that the members of the faculty in the university in Pakistan are motivated and free while implementing their work. And, as discussed in the theory section of this study, having supportive leadership has strong effect on the efficiency and outcomes of the employees (Banai and Reisel, 2007).

5.6 Leadership and delegation perception in general in Pakistan

In general, it seems that the head of the department in the university from Pakistan has succeeded in giving an understanding about himself and about his expectations to his followers. The members of the faculty all seem to talk in the same language and have the same understanding about the head of the department. This indicates that the head of the department has been successful in communicating messages and expressing himself. The only factor that was found to differ is the perception of leadership weaknesses of the head of the department. Overall understanding about what leadership is that it is associated with being an example, guiding employees towards the goals, recognising the abilities and potential of the employees, giving feedback to the employees, being true to your vision and aim and having people following you from their hearts.

The members of the faculty from the university in Pakistan expect daily guidance from the head of the department when it comes to matters that are related in administrative issues but in general guidance is not that much needed. The member of the department feel that they have freedom, the level of trust is high. Like already discussed, that trust could be the one reason why everyone is happy with the leadership of the head of the department (Drescher, 2017). Trust creates a higher
level of motivation and open-mindedness in the process of implementing one’s work. The tasks are mainly distributed according to the capabilities of the employees but sometimes also in order to challenge the employee.

5.7 Leadership and delegation perception similarities and differences between Sweden and Pakistan

When comparing the results from Sweden and from Pakistan, it is visible that in both places the respondents seem to be satisfied with the leadership that they are experiencing. At both places, the members of the faculty seem to feel that they are being trusted by the head of the department and the way the head of the department communicates tasks to them. Therefore, it indicates that the statement by House which says that through assigning responsibilities that are purposeful and through giving employees full power over decision making, and also recognizing the abilities of the employees, it creates higher likeability and popularity among their employees, can be considered applicable in the context of this study (House et al, 1971). It was pointed out that in Sweden it might happen sometimes that the head of the department does not always give all the components or details of the task but on the other hand, his way of communication was found to be clear and understandable in general while distributing tasks. In both places, people appreciate that they and their opinions are being listened by the head of the department and often taken in consideration.

When it comes to expectations towards leadership, it appears that in both countries it is expected that the leaders are transformational. Also, when the perception of leadership is being viewed in general (cf. table 3), both in the university in Sweden and in the university in Pakistan, there are four main similar perceptions that can be pointed out as important when understanding leadership: i) being an example to your followers; ii) having a clear vision and sticking to it; iii) knowing people and therefore, also seeing their abilities and potential and iv) having teamwork. Therefore, it can be said that both perceptions or understandings seem to be quite similar in their nature, which on the other hand does not go together with theoretical understandings, that state that culture has enormous impact on leadership style and that depending on the traditions, norms, values and understandings the difference occurs (Ralston, 1993; Shenkar, 1987; and House, 2002). On the other hand, as the table 3 also shows, there are some differences when it comes to leadership perception: i) guiding employees towards the goals; ii) giving feedback to the employees; iii) having people following you from their hearts; iv) working hard; v) having overview of what is going on; vi) motivating and vii) having empathy. But, when it comes to these differences, they
are being pointed out by few respondents, whereas the similarities are being pointed out by multiple respondents of this study. This can indicate that leadership can be perceived in a different way in Sweden and Pakistan, but the perception of leadership has also four strong common aspects. When looking closer to the similarities and differences, for instance having a vision is one of the similarities and then guiding employees towards the goal is a difference, we can see that this similarity and difference do not stand far from each other. In other words, being guided towards goals often involves having a vision where one wants to go. In Sweden it was pointed out that having an overview about what is going on is part of leadership – this was not pointed out by the respondents in Pakistan that context, but it was emphasized by the respondents in Pakistan that they like to have and give an overview about what is going on. So, therefore these differences that are pointed out are important but in the different stages of this study it comes up how eventually everyone expects and perceives similar things.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAKISTAN</th>
<th>SWEDEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Being an example;</td>
<td>• Having teamwork;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Guiding employees towards the goals;</td>
<td>• Having a clear vision;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recognising the abilities and potential of the employees;</td>
<td>• Working hard;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Giving feedback to the employees;</td>
<td>• Being an example in front of the followers;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Having teamwork;</td>
<td>• Having overview about what is going on;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Being true to your vision and aim;</td>
<td>• Knowing people;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Having people following you from their hearths.</td>
<td>• Motivating;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Having empathy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Similarities (marked green) and differences (unmarked) in understanding leadership

One difference that can be seen and felt is that in Pakistan all the followers seem to have firm belief that the head of the department is doing an excellent job, almost all of the respondents have emphasized on that quite strongly. In Sweden of course also, people are happy with the leadership that they are experiencing, but the empathy on it is not as strong as in Pakistan. There can be different reasons, for example in Sweden the head of the department does not involve himself that much in details, but in Pakistan the head of the department seems to be aware of most of the details of the projects that are being handled and often people from their own initiative seem to report to him. It could be that as it has been mentioned by one of the respondent from Pakistan, that the
head of the department inspires people – it could be that they are seeking for inspiration through reporting processes to the head of the department. Because when you report about a certain situation and mention some problems that you might be facing. It is normal that the other side might feel a natural need to help you out with the problem and give you some ideas. At both universities, it has been pointed out that some support is needed from the head of the department, mainly administrative help. But it can be also, that deep down at least some of the members of the faculty in Pakistan seek his guidance in non-administrative issues as well, simply due to the need to report their work to the head of the department. There might be some need for receiving guidance or acceptance.

Another difference that can be pointed out from both sides is that the weaknesses of the head of the department are different. In Pakistan, the head of the department might be having some problems with time management and talking too much. In Sweden, the head of the department might not always give all the details of the task at the beginning of the process of distributing task. But, these are rather small differences when the main focus of this study is how the leadership and delegation is being perceived from both sides in the departments in both countries as everything is being understood through discussions. On the other hand, it is also a similarity that in both places weaknesses are not being evaluated by the head of the departments that strongly.

When seeking the answer to the research question that has been proposed in the introduction section of this study: How are leadership and delegation perceived in academic institutions and if culture has an impact on these perceptions? In both places, the leadership by the head of the department is perceived by the followers in line with the perception of the head of the department about his own leadership. All the components seem to be in line when it comes to the delegation as well as in leadership and they seem to fit together. As discussed above (cf. Table 3), there are four main perceptions (i) being an example to your followers; (ii) having a clear vision and sticking to it; (iii) knowing people and therefore, also seeing their abilities and potential and (iv) having teamwork), when it comes to understanding leadership in both departments and that are similar. This indicates that even when there is a strong difference between two countries, the understandings and expectations towards leadership seem to be very similar. Even though as discussed in the theoretical framework of this study that culture has possibilities to have effect on the concepts of leadership (Brodbeck, 2000). This can be of course due to the fact that most of the respondents in both countries have at some point lived and studied or even worked in other countries (cf. table 2). That indicates that they already have developed a mindset that is much
border compared to the mindset that can be common in their home countries in general. When you travel and experience other cultures, your spectrum of knowledge and understanding of other people becomes wider. When you see how leaders operate in other countries and you view their ways positively, you adopt their ways into your own concept of how leadership should be. Therefore, leadership is not really being viewed that much differently in the departments that have been focused on in this study. Leadership is being perceived quite in a similar way like discussed above. According to theory, the cultural adaptability is in relation with cross-cultural flexibility, self-confidence, self-esteem, acclimation and successfulness in implementing tasks at foreign workplace (Caligiuri, 2012). This could indicate that, also there might be some relation or influence by existing personality traits when adapting to the culture that is different ones’ own culture. For example, being flexible enough to cope with the differences that one faces in a foreign country, and in general more openminded as a person. The only difference that can be pointed out is that the head of the department in Pakistan has a quite detailed overview about the work of the members of the faculty in the department, and the head of the department in Sweden does not keep that strong track on that, but still has a general understanding.
6 CONCLUSION

In this chapter, the findings of the thesis will be summarised and concluded. Also, the response to the research question will be discussed. Further, possible theoretical and practical implications of this study are being described and proposed. Eventually, the limitations and future research approaches are being discussed.

6.1 Conclusions and findings

This study aimed to find an answer to the following research question: How are leadership and delegation perceived in academic institutions and if culture has an impact on these perceptions? Through comparative analysis that first focused on comparing departments from each university separately within the department, and later concentrated on comparing departments from both countries, it could be concluded that leadership perception in academic institutions does not have a strong influence from a cultural background. As shortly already elaborated in the last section of chapter 5, the main reason for culture to not play such a high role could be due to the fact that today's researchers in academia have a long history of travelling from one country to another. That could be because their master's or PhD studies might have been aboard, but also because later after starting their work in the field of research it is common to travel, collaborate and be involved with different projects that might take place in foreign countries. As you travel and get to live in different countries, and that means also experiencing a culture that might not be common to your own, it is highly likely that one becomes much more open towards different behavior of people. When you are open, you are also more open towards adapting to new values or understandings. This means that leadership in an academic context is not perceived differently when comparing Sweden to Pakistan.

Another factor that has been investigated through this study is that in Pakistan members of the faculty expect higher extent of overview about their work from the head of the department. It is not that much related to having more support but is rather in relation to the characteristics of the head of the department who is said to be very outgoing and inspiring. When it comes to Sweden, the head of the department does not have and need to have a constant overview about the operations that are being carried out and similarly the members of the faculty recognize that they mainly need administrative support from him. This is mostly due to the fact that head of the department in Sweden is not involved in all the research or educational activities that are being carried out. On the other hand, the head of the department in Pakistan keeps himself involved.
As a conclusion it could be stated that the leadership in Sweden and Pakistan is perceived in a quite similar way regardless of the differences of the countries investigated. That indicates that even when there are countries like Pakistan and Sweden that in general are viewed so different, there still are similarities that can be recognized. These similarities might in long term create mutual understandings and change how we perceive countries like Sweden and Pakistan. It also seems from this study that the similarities of perceptions might be because the respondents have internationalized and become more global citizens than just citizens of a one country. That shows the potential towards eventually having consensus and understanding between different nationalities in the coming future as people travel and explore more and more every day.

6.2 Theoretical implications

The focus of this study was to investigate leadership and delegation in academic institutions. This study found that leadership and delegation in academic institutions are being perceived in a similar way like the head of the departments think that they are delivering. There are no significant differences when it comes to understanding leadership in academic institutions and in companies. As it appeared through the comparison with literature in the analysis chapter, that many aspects seem to be very similar in practice and in theory when understanding leadership and how it should be. This makes a contribution, that when it comes to academic institutions, leadership is being understood in a way like it is understood when studying companies.

Also, it appears that in both countries when it comes to academic institutions, it is preferred to have transformational leadership. This yet, is another important contribution to the literature, as it gives an understanding about the expectations towards leadership style in academic institutions.

Further this study shows that leadership perceptions in both countries, that seemingly should be drastically different from each other, are being viewed in a similar way in both places and are characterized by i) being an example to your followers; ii) having a clear vision and sticking to it; iii) knowing people and therefore, also seeing their abilities and potential and iv) having teamwork. This means that when it comes to academic institutions, the understandings about leadership are not that different in countries that are considered to be different from each other in a strong way. This study gives a first insight and a theoretical contribution, that understandings about leadership in academic institutions are similar no matter the cultural differences or differences between countries. Therefore, it could be suggested that this study gives a first step towards investigating leadership perceptions in academic institution through the example of other countries in the future.
Furthermore, as this study also focused on the perception of delegation, it can be confirmed that the more trust leaders emphasize towards their employees, the more leaders are being liked and continue to gain popularity. This means that when it comes to LMX and especially delegation together with the sense of trust within it, the academic perceptions do not differ much when we talk about private companies or academia. Therefore, this study adds an understanding that when it comes to academic institutions, delegation is something that is being viewed in a similar way like we already are used to.

6.3 Practical implications

This study was conducted in two countries that have completely different cultural settings. Leadership and delegation perceptions were gathered from the members of the faculty and the head of the departments in order to understand how leadership and delegation are being perceived. As this research focused on academic environment and context, this study gives a valuable insight into how culture does not influence that strongly the perception of leadership and delegation when it comes to academia.

Furthermore, this research helps to build a better culture of the companies that have a diverse workforce and especially if the workforce is highly educated. These days industries are more and more hiring professionals that have PhD's to have manpower that can conduct scientific research for the sake of the development of company's technologies. Through understanding how leadership and delegation might be perceived, it is possible for the companies to design their leadership accordingly and also give a certain amount of freedom to the researchers.

Another insight that this study gives is that delegation and also feeling of being trusted is expected in both cultural settings. This indicates that leaders should consider finding ways how to make their employees feel more trusted and that not only in private sector but also inside academia.

6.4 Limitations

This study has been conducted during a short period of time, and all of the empirical data has been gathered through structured interviews. In a situation where the time constraints would not have been there, an observation in both departments could have been implemented in order to observe the actual feeling of the atmosphere – which would have been possible if the language used in departments would be English (often it can be the language of the country where the university is operating).
Another limitation of this study is the fact that research is based on only one university in Sweden and similarly based on one university in Pakistan and this study has been conducted in only one department in both universities. Also, as the data gathered from Sweden happened to not be from people who are born as Swedes, it could limit the findings of this study to some extent and possible differences might appear if only Swedes would be studied. It is worth mentioning here that some of the respondents from Sweden have received Swedish citizenship and have strongly integrated into Swedish way of life.

Another factor that could limit this study is that as the main data was gathered through interviews, there is always a possibility that the respondents did not always give completely honest answers or did not elaborate in a completely sincere way.

6.5 Suggestions for further research

As mentioned in the limitations section, the data for this study was gathered based on two universities and in both universities based on one department. It could be interesting to investigate how leadership and delegations are being perceived in other departments and also in other universities in both countries. It should be investigated if the leadership and delegation perceptions in Sweden still would be similar to the findings of this study if the respondents would be all born with Swedish nationalities.

Also, similar studies could be implemented in other countries in order to make even more precise conclusions about the perception of leadership and delegation in an academic context and it would be interesting to test it in a quantitative study. As it has appeared that culture does not have much role when it comes to leadership and delegation in academia, it could be interesting to study how views about leadership and delegation change during travelling and studying for a longer period in foreign countries and also how the change of perceptions develops. In other words, it could be interesting to see how experiencing different cultures influences common ways of viewing leadership and delegation.
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# APPENDIX

A. Empirical data from Sweden

## Table 4. Data from Sweden – Leadership (continued on the next page)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEADERSHIP</th>
<th>Subject 1 HD</th>
<th>Subject 2</th>
<th>Subject 3</th>
<th>Subject 4</th>
<th>Subject 5</th>
<th>Subject 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meaning of leadership</td>
<td>• Understanding what is going on</td>
<td>• Having empathy</td>
<td>• Having a team to do a task together</td>
<td>• Being a role model</td>
<td>• Gives example</td>
<td>• Managing people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowing people</td>
<td>• Clear vision</td>
<td>• Encouraging people</td>
<td>• Giving guidelines</td>
<td>• Motivates</td>
<td>• Managing projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Having strategic direction</td>
<td>• Great understanding of the field</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Being hardworking</td>
<td>• Encourage</td>
<td>• Making sure that everything fits together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ability for teamwork</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Motivating people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership in the department</td>
<td>• Supportive, solving problems</td>
<td>• Very open</td>
<td>• Understanding</td>
<td>• Receiving guidelines</td>
<td>• Supportive</td>
<td>• Able to encourage people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Easy going</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Helpful</td>
<td>• Good manager of resources</td>
<td>• Open for discussion</td>
<td>• Makes sure that things are done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Approachable</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Follows up</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Listens and takes in count what you say</td>
<td>• Having overall view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approachability</td>
<td>• Easily approachable</td>
<td>• He is approachable</td>
<td>• Easy to approach</td>
<td>• Easily approachable</td>
<td>• Always easy to approach</td>
<td>• Very accessible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conversations</td>
<td>• Middle of being comfortable due to the higher position of the HD</td>
<td>• He always tries to help</td>
<td>• Welcoming</td>
<td>• Being open minded</td>
<td>• Door always opened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Encouraging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Yearly sessions</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Openminded person and that is visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Traditional breakfast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SWEDEN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEADERSHIP</th>
<th>Subject 1 HD</th>
<th>Subject 2</th>
<th>Subject 3</th>
<th>Subject 4</th>
<th>Subject 5</th>
<th>Subject 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good leadership</td>
<td>• Having general view</td>
<td>• Getting things done, achieving results</td>
<td>• Working for the employees</td>
<td>• Being a role model</td>
<td>• Being aware of the motivations of the employees</td>
<td>• Being able to motivate people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Serving the employees</td>
<td>• Being friendly, nice</td>
<td>• Easy to talk with</td>
<td>• Hard working</td>
<td>• Being supportive</td>
<td>• Being encouraged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Being easy to work with</td>
<td>• Supportive</td>
<td>• Communicating</td>
<td>• Being encouraging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Giving freedom</td>
<td>• Working towards the objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Transparency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Feeling of being part of everything</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad leadership</td>
<td>• Putting own needs before other needs</td>
<td>• Someone who is hard to deal with</td>
<td>• Keeping no record of the people working for you</td>
<td>• Having no vision</td>
<td>• Not supporting</td>
<td>• Doing something because someone is telling you to do that without really having the reason why</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Not having overview</td>
<td>• Not able to achieve results</td>
<td>• Not listening</td>
<td>• Overloading employees</td>
<td>• Telling do something that he himself is not capable to do</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Assigning tasks without considering availability</td>
<td>• Not producing results</td>
<td>• Dictates tasks without any follow up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence level</td>
<td>• Confident</td>
<td>• Confident</td>
<td>• Confident</td>
<td>• Confident</td>
<td>• Confident</td>
<td>• Confident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership strengths</td>
<td>• Listening people</td>
<td>• Working really hard</td>
<td>• Working a lot</td>
<td>• Communication</td>
<td>• Easy to talk with him</td>
<td>• You are not imposed, you are suggested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Serving the employees</td>
<td>• Good researcher</td>
<td>• Supportive</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Feels like he is a colleague</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Having good overview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4. Data from Sweden – Leadership (continued on the next page)*
Table 4. Data from Sweden – Leadership (continued on the next page)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DELEGATION</th>
<th>Subject 1 HD</th>
<th>Subject 2</th>
<th>Subject 3</th>
<th>Subject 4</th>
<th>Subject 5</th>
<th>Subject 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need for continuous guidance</td>
<td>• No need</td>
<td>• Maybe a bit</td>
<td>• Sometimes in career planning</td>
<td>• Yes, his mentorship</td>
<td>• Not necessarily</td>
<td>• For the things that are new, that need to be learnt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication channels</td>
<td>• Verbally</td>
<td>• Verbal</td>
<td>• Verbal</td>
<td>• E-mail</td>
<td>• Verbal</td>
<td>• E-mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Way of giving tasks</td>
<td>• Verbally</td>
<td>• Verbally</td>
<td>• Verbally</td>
<td>• Verbally</td>
<td>• Verbally</td>
<td>• E-mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving, receiving high responsibility tasks</td>
<td>• High</td>
<td>• Not much</td>
<td>• Sometimes</td>
<td>• Most tasks are high responsibility</td>
<td>• In some extent</td>
<td>• Don’t think that he has received much these kind of tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of trust</td>
<td>• Trusting 100%</td>
<td>• Being trusted</td>
<td>• Being trusted</td>
<td>• Being trusted</td>
<td>• Being trusted</td>
<td>• Being trusted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics of a clear task</td>
<td>• Delivered through discussion</td>
<td>• Having the description of context</td>
<td>• Having information about the task</td>
<td>• Communicating them through meetings or e-mails</td>
<td>• Giving details</td>
<td>• Assigning a task that people are able to deliver</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Data from Sweden – Delegation (continued on the next page)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DELEGATION</th>
<th>Subject 1 HD</th>
<th>Subject 2</th>
<th>Subject 3</th>
<th>Subject 4</th>
<th>Subject 5</th>
<th>Subject 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occurring of misunderstandings</td>
<td>• None</td>
<td>• None</td>
<td>• None</td>
<td>• None</td>
<td>• None</td>
<td>• None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misunderstanding general view</td>
<td>• Good because opens up new views</td>
<td>• Good as a warning that something is wrong</td>
<td>• Can be hurtful</td>
<td>• Not good</td>
<td>• Not good but it happens</td>
<td>• Some frictions • Received that that did not want to do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for constant overview</td>
<td>• No need</td>
<td>• No need</td>
<td>• No need</td>
<td>• No</td>
<td>• No need</td>
<td>• No need for that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression of satisfaction</td>
<td>• Simply by telling</td>
<td>• Telling during yearly talks • E-mail</td>
<td>• During yearly meeting • Small % add to salary</td>
<td>• E-mail</td>
<td>• Announcing during the weekly meeting</td>
<td>• He says it • During yearly meeting • Cake for everyone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Data from Sweden – Delegation (continued on the next page)
B. Empirical data from Pakistan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEADERSHIP</th>
<th>Subject 1 HD</th>
<th>Subject 2</th>
<th>Subject 3</th>
<th>Subject 4</th>
<th>Subject 5</th>
<th>Subject 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meaning of leadership</td>
<td>• Having people following one through their hearts</td>
<td>• Setting up an example to follow</td>
<td>• Recognizing the potential of the team</td>
<td>• Ability to guide people towards a direction</td>
<td>• Having team work</td>
<td>• Taking responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Being true to you field and vision</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Recognize interests</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Distributing work among team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Giving feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership in the department</td>
<td>• Finds his leadership to be very good and successful</td>
<td>• Sets up an example from the technical point of view</td>
<td>• Keeping friendly environment</td>
<td>• Good leadership</td>
<td>• Knowing capability of the people</td>
<td>• Good leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Has majority of traits that leader should have</td>
<td>• Has majority of traits that leader should have</td>
<td>• Doing good job</td>
<td>• Having a direction</td>
<td>• Knows where to put focus</td>
<td>• Gives freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Explaining decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Having good leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approachability</td>
<td>• Approachable</td>
<td>• Approachable</td>
<td>• Approachable</td>
<td>• Approachable</td>
<td>• No boundaries in approaching</td>
<td>• Easy to approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Friendly and frank relationship</td>
<td>• Very friendly</td>
<td>• Always there to listen</td>
<td>• Family environment</td>
<td>• He is flexible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Data from Pakistan – Leadership (continued on the next page)
### Good leadership
- Having followers believing in the same cause
- Having opened mind for opinions
- Make followers emotionally connect to you
- Taking initiative
- Setting an example by doing first what he expects to be done
- Realizing the potential of the employees
- Motivating
- Keeping people involved
- Inspiring people
- Keeping people involved
- Inspiring people
- Making others adopt your vision

### Bad leadership
- Not connecting with people that you lead
- Having no correct vision
- Not knowing where the world is going
- Telling others to do but not doing yourself
- Being bossy
- Not listening
- Discouraging
- Not involving you in discussions
- Feeling insecure, not having confidence
- Being bossy
- Someone who does not listen to you
- People who ask to do something but not being involved themselves

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEADERSHIP</th>
<th>Subject 1 HD</th>
<th>Subject 2</th>
<th>Subject 3</th>
<th>Subject 4</th>
<th>Subject 5</th>
<th>Subject 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good leadership</td>
<td>- Confident</td>
<td>- Confident</td>
<td>- Very confident</td>
<td>- Very confident</td>
<td>- Very confident</td>
<td>- Confident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad leadership</td>
<td>- Not connecting with people that you lead</td>
<td>- Telling others to do but not doing yourself</td>
<td>- Being bossy</td>
<td>- Not listening</td>
<td>- Discouraging</td>
<td>- Not involving you in discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence level</td>
<td>- Confident</td>
<td>- Confident</td>
<td>- Very confident</td>
<td>- Very confident</td>
<td>- Very confident</td>
<td>- Confident</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.** Data from Pakistan – Leadership (continued on the next page)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEADERSHIP</th>
<th>Subject 1 HD</th>
<th>Subject 2</th>
<th>Subject 3</th>
<th>Subject 4</th>
<th>Subject 5</th>
<th>Subject 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership strengths</td>
<td>• Sincerity for the cause</td>
<td>• Communication</td>
<td>• Having friendly nature</td>
<td>• Knowledge and expertise in the field</td>
<td>• Flexibility</td>
<td>• Listening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sincerity for the team</td>
<td>• Having wide spectrum of knowledge</td>
<td>• Knowing strengths and weaknesses of the member of the faculty</td>
<td>• Team work</td>
<td>• Inspiring people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ability to communicate</td>
<td>• Ability to communicate</td>
<td>• Ability to communicate</td>
<td>• Knowing strengths and weaknesses of the member of the faculty</td>
<td>• Patience</td>
<td>• NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership weaknesses</td>
<td>• Finds wanting to have fun to be a weakness</td>
<td>• Time management</td>
<td>• Being extremely busy, having too much on his plate</td>
<td>• Time management</td>
<td>• Too occupied often</td>
<td>• NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Time management</td>
<td>• Speaking too much sometimes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations, goals</td>
<td>• People are happy with the leadership</td>
<td>• Giving time and space for own research</td>
<td>• Motivating</td>
<td>• Feeling of being involved</td>
<td>• Growth of the faculty</td>
<td>• Guidance from the HD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• One of the Pakistani or own university comes among top 100 in the world</td>
<td></td>
<td>• And helping to realize my potential</td>
<td>• Good behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Make department extraordinary</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Providing friendly environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5.* Data from Pakistan – Leadership (continued on the next page)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DELEGATION</th>
<th>Subject 1 HD</th>
<th>Subject 2</th>
<th>Subject 3</th>
<th>Subject 4</th>
<th>Subject 5</th>
<th>Subject 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication channels</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Home phone</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>E-mails</td>
<td>Whatsapp</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Whatsapp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>Phone messages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Way of giving tasks</td>
<td>Depends on the abilities</td>
<td>Verbally</td>
<td>Office meetings</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Verbally</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verbally</td>
<td>phone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving, receiving high responsibility tasks</td>
<td>Have to see good in the person</td>
<td>Receives many high responsibility tasks</td>
<td>Receiving HD duties when the HD is away</td>
<td>In some extent</td>
<td>Somewhere in the middle</td>
<td>Gives high responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Likes to see what tasks employees can handle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of trust</td>
<td>Trusting</td>
<td>Being trusted</td>
<td>Being trusted</td>
<td>Being trusted</td>
<td>Being trusted</td>
<td>Being trusted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics of a clear task</td>
<td>Being open with the team</td>
<td>Having it in written form</td>
<td>Free and opened communication</td>
<td>Written clearly</td>
<td>Having pullet points</td>
<td>Knowing history of the task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task should not be forced on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Being told how to achieve the aim of the task</td>
<td>Bing in written form</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Data from Pakistan – Delegation (continued on the next page)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DELEGATION</th>
<th>Subject 1 HD</th>
<th>Subject 2</th>
<th>Subject 3</th>
<th>Subject 4</th>
<th>Subject 5</th>
<th>Subject 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practical task communication</td>
<td>• Communicating clearly, ability to convert thoughts into words</td>
<td>• Clear communication because of the notes that HD does</td>
<td>• Clear task communicatio n</td>
<td>• Clear communicatio n</td>
<td>• Very clear communicatio n</td>
<td>• Clear communicatio n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>occurring of misunderstandings</td>
<td>• It has happened once from a problem point of view</td>
<td>• Misunderstanding due to overload of work</td>
<td>• No important misunderstandings</td>
<td>• No misunderstandings</td>
<td>• No misunderstandings</td>
<td>• Misunderstandings due to overload of work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misunderstanding general view</td>
<td>• Misunderstandings are bad</td>
<td>• Misunderstandings are bad</td>
<td>• Misunderstandings are bad</td>
<td>• Good because you can learn from them</td>
<td>• Misunderstandings are bad</td>
<td>• Can be both ways but in general bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for constant overview</td>
<td>• It is good to have overview</td>
<td>• Asks for overview but not strictly</td>
<td>• Asks overview about the tasks that he has given</td>
<td>• No constant overview</td>
<td>• No constant overview</td>
<td>• No constant overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression of satisfaction</td>
<td>• Facial expressions are obvious</td>
<td>• Guessing from the reactions</td>
<td>• Verbally during meetings</td>
<td>• He seems always happy</td>
<td>• By the mood</td>
<td>• Letting us know if he is happy or not</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.** Data from Pakistan – Delegation
C. Interview question to the head of the department

National background and cultures’ possible effect towards employees’ perception of leadership and delegation: Pakistan vs. Sweden

I am an international student in the master’s programme “Strategic Entrepreneurship for international Growth” from Halmstad University, Sweden. The interview guide focuses on two main topics of the research: i) Leadership perception and ii) the delegation between the leader and employees.

Interview questions for the head of the department

Introduction
1. What is your age and nationality?
2. Describe your professional background.
3. For how long have you worked at your current position?
4. What was the motive or reason to start working on this position?

Leadership
1. What associates to you with leadership? In other words, what do you think leadership is?
2. How would you describe yourself as a leader?
3. Do you think that your employees can easily approach you?
4. What do you do in order to make your employees feel more comfortable in approaching you?
5. What does good leadership mean to you?
6. What would be bad leadership from your point of view?
7. What do you do as a leader in order to be a good leader and how do you avoid bad leadership?
8. Do you feel confident in your role as the head of the department? Explain.
9. What are your strengths and weaknesses as a leader?
10. What are your goals as a leader?
11. How do you think that your employees might be seeing you as a leader?

Delegation
1. Do you think that your employees need constant guidance by you? Explain
2. What kind of communication channels do you use while communicating with your employees?
3. How do you distribute tasks?
4. In what extent do you give your employees high responsibility tasks?
5. Is it easy for you to trust your employees in tasks that are more complex? Why?
6. What are the main aspects in order to delegate tasks clearly?
7. Do you think that as a leader you communicate tasks clearly? Explain.
8. Has it happened that some of your employees have faced misunderstandings with you? What has been the main reason for misunderstandings?
9. Are misunderstandings good? Why?
10. Do you need to have constant overview about what your employees are doing? Explain.
11. How do you express that you are satisfied with the work that has been done?
12. Is there anything else that you would like to add about leadership and delegation?

Thank you!
D. Interview question to the employees

National background and cultures’ possible effect towards employees’ perception of leadership and delegation: Pakistan vs. Sweden

I am an international student in the master’s programme “Strategic Entrepreneurship for international Growth” from Halmstad University, Sweden. The interview guide focuses on two main topics of the research: i) Leadership perception and ii) the delegation between the leader and employees.

Interview questions for the employees

Introduction
1. What is your age and nationality?
2. Describe your professional background.
3. For how long have you worked at your current position?
4. What was the motive or reason to start working on this position?

Leadership
1. What associates to you with leadership? In other words, what do you think leadership is?
2. How would you describe the leadership of the head of the department?
3. Do you think that you can easily approach the head of the department?
4. Has the head of the department done anything in order make you more comfortable in approaching him?
5. What does good leadership mean to you?
6. What would be bad leadership from your point of view?
7. What does the head of the department do in order to be a good leader and how do you think he avoids bad leadership?
8. Do you think that the head of your department feels confident in his role as the head of the department? Explain.
9. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the head of your department as a leader?
10. What do you expect from your leader?

Delegation
1. Do you think that you need guidance by the head of the department?
2. What kind of communication channels do you use while communicating with your leader?
3. How do you receive tasks?
4. In what extent do you receive high responsibility tasks?
5. Do you think that you are being trusted in tasks that are more complex? Why?
6. What are the main aspects in order to receive tasks clearly?
7. Do you think that your leader communicates tasks clearly? Explain.
8. Has it happened that you have faced misunderstandings with the head of your department? What has been the main reason for misunderstandings?
9. Are misunderstandings good? Why?
10. Does the head of the department ask for constant overview about what you are doing? Explain.
11. How does the head of the department express that he is satisfied with the work that has been done?
12. Is there anything that you would like to add about leadership and delegation?

Thank you!
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