Cross-Cultural Leadership Studies

Dr. Alan S. Gutterman
August 2017

Cross-Cultural Leadership Studies

About the Project

The Sustainable Entrepreneurship Project (www.seproject.org) engages in and promotes research, education and training activities relating to entrepreneurial ventures launched with the aspiration to create sustainable enterprises that achieve significant growth in scale and value creation through the development of innovative products or services which form the basis for a successful international business. In furtherance of its mission the Project is involved in the preparation and distribution of Libraries of Resources for Sustainable Entrepreneurs covering Entrepreneurship, Leadership, Management, Organizational Design, Organizational Culture, Strategic Planning, Governance, Corpoorate Social Responsibility, Compliance and Risk Management, Finance, Human Resources, Product Development and Commercialization, Technology Management, Globalization, and Managing Growth and Change. Each of the Libraries include various Project publications such as handbooks, guides, briefings, articles, checklists, forms, forms, videos and audio works and other resources; management tools such as checklists and questionnaires, forms and training materials; books; chapters or articles in books; articles in journals, newspapers and magazines; theses and dissertations; papers; government and other public domain publications; online articles and databases; blogs; websites; and webinars and podcasts. Changes to the Library are made on a continuous basis and notifications of changes, as well as new versions of this Research Paper, will be provided to readers that enter their names on the Project mailing list by following the procedures on the Project's website.

About the Author

Dr. Alan S. Gutterman is the Founding Director of the Sustainable Entrepreneurship Project and the Founding Director of the Business Counselor Institute (www.businesscounselorinstitute.org), which distributes Dr. Gutterman's widely-recognized portfolio of timely and practical legal and business information for attorneys, other professionals and executives in the form of books, online content, webinars, videos, podcasts, newsletters and training programs. Dr. Gutterman has over three decades of experience as a partner and senior counsel with internationally recognized law firms counseling small and large business enterprises in the areas of general corporate and securities matters, venture capital, mergers and acquisitions, international law and transactions, strategic business alliances, technology transfers and intellectual property,

and has also held senior management positions with several technology-based businesses including service as the chief legal officer of a leading international distributor of IT products headquartered in Silicon Valley and as the chief operating officer of an emerging broadband media company. He received his A.B., M.B.A., and J.D. from the University of California at Berkeley, a D.B.A. from Golden Gate University, and a Ph. D. from the University of Cambridge. For more information about Dr. Gutterman, his publications, the Sustainable Entrepreneurship Project or the Business Counselor Institute, please contact him directly at alangutterman@gmail.com.

Preface

The ongoing and extensive study of leadership and the ways in which leaders and their subordinates, often referred to as "followers", have led to the advancement of a number of theories and models. For example, "trait" and "behavior" theories emphasize the personal characteristics of the leader. The leader's use of power and position to influence the actions of his or her followers is the focus of "power and influence" theory. Researchers using "contingency" and "contextual" theories are primarily interested in studying how the effectiveness of leader behaviors is impacted by the situation and characteristics of the subordinates. The nature and quality of the relationship between the leader and his or her subordinates is paramount in "transactional" theories and the attributions and perceptions of members of a society regarding leadership and the appropriate actions of leaders are the basis for "attributional" theories. Finally, "neocharismatic" or "transformational" theories of leadership are based on the premise that leaders can achieve extraordinary results through their used of "symbolic, emotional and highly motivating behaviors that appeal both to followers' minds and hearts".[1]

During the early years of serious research in the leadership area the focus was primarily on Western leadership styles and practices—not surprising given that US researchers dominated the field; however, several factors—globalization of the workforce, expansion of operations into numerous around the world and exposure to increase global competition—have forced leadership scholars to incorporate culture into their research and theories since leaders of businesses of all sizes in all countries must be prepared to interact with customers and other business partners from different cultures and leaders of larger companies have the additional challenge of managing multinational organizations and aligning a global corporate culture with multiple and diverging national cultures.

It has also been suggested that culture plays an important role in many aspects of how leaders develop and implement their leadership styles and how they interact with those persons who look to them for guidance. Early cross-cultural research regarding leadership focused on how cultural values impacted the authority of the leader, the personal characteristics of the leader (e.g., the leader's image in the eyes of his or her followers), the interpersonal actions between leaders and their followers, and the relationship between leaders and various groups within their organizations. For example, the applicable cultural values regarding power distance appeared to clearly have an impact on how leaders and their followers viewed the authority that the leader was entitled and expected to exercise—in large power distance societies it was presumed that leaders would have a substantial amount of authority that could and would be exercised with little in the way of input from followers regarding possible solutions and strategies. In addition, cultural preferences regarding "ideal" leadership styles and attributes that were articulated by followers could serve as the basis for the image that a leader attempted to craft in order to appear to be effective in that role.[2]

---

[1] H. Zagoršek, Assessing the impact of national culture on leadership: A six nation study (September 2004) miha.ef.uni-lj.si/_dokumenti/wp/zagoršek-članek.doc [accessed February 16, 2011]

[2] M. Dickson, D. Den Hartog and J. Mitchelson, "Research on leadership in a cross-cultural context: Making progress, and raising new questions", The Leadership Quarterly, 14 (2003), 729-768, 760 (citing

This Research Paper begins with an introduction to cross-cultural leadership studies and the often intense debate among leadership scholars as to whether attributes of leadership are perceived in the same way—positively or negatively—across all societal cultures (i.e., universally), or whether the perception of those attributes varied across the range of societal cultures ("culturally contingent"). The Research Paper then continues with discussion, analysis and criticism of the Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness project, commonly referred to as "GLOBE", which was an ambitious effort to identify and measure relationships between culture and preferred leadership styles and behaviors.[3] The GLOBE project was launched in large part to address an issue that was becoming increasingly clear—that theories of leadership needed to revisited and, if necessary, updated to take into account the impact that culture has on how leadership is enacted in various societies around the world. Ardichvili and Kuchinke noted that in the mid-1990s scholars such as House had observed that the then-prevailing theories of leadership were dominated by North American characteristics with the result being that those theories were grounded in fundamental assumptions such as "individualism as opposed to collectivism, rationality rather than ascetics, hedonistic rather than altruistic motivation, centrality of work, and democratic value orientation".[4] As the decade ended, however, the evidence from research conducted in the areas of cross-cultural psychology and sociology was overwhelming that many cultures do not share those same assumptions and that it was likely that "characteristic leadership attributes" would vary across societies due to cultural differences.[5]

The Research Paper also discusses cross-cultural competencies of global leaders—the practical applications of the information available from the studies of the GLOBE researchers and others to the day-to-day activities of leaders in business organizations around the world. Finally, the Research Paper assesses the research on cross-cultural leadership, reviews earlier arguments of Hofstede that attempts by US managers and consultants to transfer their theories of leadership to other countries will produce

---

the discussion of a "culture enveloping model of leadership" described in P. Dorfman, "International and cross-cultural leadership research," In B. Punnett and O. Shenkar (Eds.), Handbook for International Management Research (2nd ed.). (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, 2003).

[3] For detailed discussion of the methodology used in the GLOBE research, see "Globalization: A Library of Resources for Sustainable Entrepreneurs" prepared and distributed by the Sustainable Entrepreneurship Project (www.seproject.org).

[4] A. Ardichvili and K. Kuchinke, "Leadership styles and cultural values among managers and subordinates: a comparative study of four countries of the former Soviet Union, Germany and the US," Human Resource Development International, 5(1) (2002): 99-117, 102 (referencing R. House, "Leadership in 21st century: a speculative inquiry", in A. Howard (ed) The Changing Nature of Work (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1995)). Among the "prevailing" North American theories referred to in the quote were McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y, Likert's "System Four" management model and Blake and Mouton's "Managerial Grid", all of which are described in "Human Resources: A Library of Resources for Sustainable Entrepreneurs" prepared and distributed by the Sustainable Entrepreneurship Project (www.seproject.org).

[5] D. Den Hartog, R. House, P. Hanges et al., "Culture specific and cross-culturally generalizable implicit leadership theories: are attributes of charismatic/transformational leadership universally endorsed?", Leadership Quarterly, 10(2) (1999), 219-56. See also R. House, "Leadership in 21st century: a speculative inquiry", in A. Howard (ed) The Changing Nature of Work (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1995), 443 (". . . there is a growing awareness of the need for a better understanding of the way that leadership is enacted in various cultures").

disappointment results due to the failure to understand cultural differences in the transferee countries and discussed research on culture and leadership in developing countries.

Chapter 1
Cross-Cultural Leadership Studies

§1:1   Introduction

It is fair to say that a good deal of the activity with respect to cross-cultural studies over the last years has focused on cross-cultural leadership. Culture plays an important role in many aspects of how leaders develop and implement their leadership styles and how they interact with those persons who look to them for guidance. Dickson et al. have noted the growing acceptance of cross-cultural leadership as an identifiable and independent field of study and research separate from the most established and well-known fields of cross-cultural research and leadership research.[6] The research conducted regarding leadership has focused on how cultural values impact the authority of the leader, the personal characteristics of the leader (e.g., the leader's image in the eyes of his or her followers), the interpersonal actions between leaders and their followers and the relationship between leaders and various groups within their organizations. For example, the applicable cultural values regarding power distance appear to clearly have an impact on how leaders and their followers view the authority that the leader is entitled and expected to exercise—in large power distance societies it is presumed that leaders will have a substantial amount of authority that can and will be exercised with little in the way of input from followers regarding possible solutions and strategies. In addition, cultural preferences regarding "ideal" leadership styles and attributes that are articulated by followers can serve as the basis for the image that a leader attempts to craft in order to appear to be effective in that role.[7]

Dickson et al. have cited several factors that have contributed to the emergence of cross-cultural leadership research including the proliferation of publication outlets for cross-cultural leadership research and the launch of several large studies of the relationship between leadership and culture (e.g., the Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness ("GLOBE") project) involving a number of countries and multiple investigators drawn from around the world with their own cultural backgrounds and the corresponding ability to bring a different viewpoint to the questions asked and the data that is collected.[8] These two factors are related to some extent because the growth of

---

[6] M. Dickson, D. Den Hartog and J. Mitchelson, "Research on leadership in a cross-cultural context: Making progress, and raising new questions", The Leadership Quarterly, 14 (2003), 729-768, 748.

[7] Id. at 760 (citing the discussion of a "culture enveloping model of leadership" described in P. Dorfman, "International and cross-cultural leadership research," In B. Punnett and O. Shenkar (Eds.), Handbook for international management research (2nd ed.). (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, 2003)).

[8] Id. at 748. Dickson et al. referred to several examples of the publication outlets in this area including *The Leadership Quarterly*, the 2002 issue of *The Journal of World Business* focusing on the GLOBE project and a biennial series titled *Advances in Global Leadership* published by JAI Press. The researchers who launched *Advances in Global Research* provided a short, but useful, list of the potential advantages of comparative management studies and cross-cultural studies. First of all, they sought to facilitate understanding of the interplay between national and organizational cultures, organizational strategy, the stage of development of the organization and/or business units within the organization, as well understanding of individual differences. Second, they were interested in evaluating the generalizability of models and practices developed in Western cultures, particularly leadership and management practices used

publication outlets has provided additional incentives for researchers, most of which come from the academic community, to embark on the larger, more time-intensive multinational studies. In addition, researchers looking to carve a niche in the emerging field of cross-cultural leadership studies are anxious to contribute their talents to ambitious undertakings such as the GLOBE project, which has generated an extensive body of literature on numerous countries and so-called "outcomes of interest". Interest in multinational studies has also been enhanced by improvements in necessary technological and analytic tools that allow researchers from all parts of the world to communicate and collaborate and work effectively with large amounts of data is well organized and adaptable for rigorous statistical analysis.

The large multinational studies have addressed several of the criticisms commonly made of traditional research in both comparative management studies and cross-cultural studies—the excessive reliance on two-culture studies that provide very limited information that is difficult to place within the broader context of the literature in the applicable discipline. For example, while it may be interesting to hear that a researcher claims to have discovered differences between a group of farmers in Country A and a group of farmers in Country B with respect to a commonly recognized cultural dimension such as uncertainty avoidance this information often creates more questions than answers including the following: has a similar study using the same variables and measures been done among farmers in two or more different countries, which would provide a broader context for the results of the Country A/Country B study; would the results of the Country A/Country B study be the same if different measures of chosen variables were used or the study was conducted by a researcher with a different cultural background; or would the results of the Country A/Country B study be different if the sample groups consisted of lawyers (or some other group) instead of farmers. Carefully constructed multinational studies reduce a number of potential problems associated with studies of a small number of countries by introducing uniformity of the instruments and construct definitions used in data collection and analysis phases; tapping into the cultural diversity of investigative team members from around the world, not just one country such as the US; and generating data from multiple cultures that can be subjected to sophisticated statistical analysis (i.e., multiple regression) to provide significantly greater insights into whether a particular cultural dimension influences an "outcome of interest" and, if so, just how strong that influence might be.[9]

---

in the US. Finally, research relating to multicultural and global leadership has expanded to address the challenges that managers now commonly confront when working in "nontraditional" organizational structures such as joint ventures and strategic alliances. See W. Mobley and M. McCall (Eds.), Advances in Global Leadership, Vol. 2 (New York: JAI Press, 2001).

[9] M. Dickson, D. Den Hartog and J. Mitchelson, "Research on leadership in a cross-cultural context: Making progress, and raising new questions," The Leadership Quarterly 14 (2003) 729-768, 748-749. A number of multinational studies have actually been launched to test for broader applicability of findings identified in earlier single country studies. For example, one study collected data from a number of countries with differing cultural dimensions to support the claims of Bass that transformational leadership is endorsed in a number of different cultures. See A. Ardichvili, "Leadership styles and work-related values of managers and employees of manufacturing enterprises in post-communist countries," Human Resource Development Quarterly, 12(4) (2001), 363-383. One of the criticisms of Bass had been that his claims were primarily based on results obtained in studies within a single country that compared transformational to transactional leadership styles in just one cultural context.

GLOBE represents the largest and arguably most influential multinational study of national culture and the impact of culture on leadership styles and behaviors. While Hofstede and others may quarrel with the path that the GLOBE researchers took with regard to instrument design and data analysis it is nonetheless important to take note of some of the innovative techniques that GLOBE sought to introduce to the field. The GLOBE researchers themselves provided the following list of what they regarded as the strengths of their approach as part of their response to various criticisms of GLOBE lodged by Hofstede: theory-driven constructs; a total of over 160 researchers from 62 societies were involved in the research design from the very beginning and they conducted individual and focus group interviews with managers in their own countries; all of the local investigators received questionnaire items and provided reports on their face validity, understandability and relevance in their own cultures; items were edited on the basis of these reports and new items were added; the final draft of the items went through a very rigorous psychometric process for instrument design; the surviving instruments were translated and back-translated in each country; pilot tests were conducted in several countries to empirically verify the cultural dimensions common source error was controlled for in the research design; rigorous statistical procedures to verify that the scales are aggregable, unidimensional and reliable, and to ensure cross-cultural differences; state-of-the-art statistical techniques (HLM) used to test a priori hypotheses, showing that the culture-to-leadership relationships existed at organizational or societal level, not individual level; rigorous statistical evidence for relationship between societal and organizational culture; and multimethod-multitrait analysis and multilevel confirmatory factor analysis to establish construct validity.[10]

Multinational studies have been used with respect to a number of issues other than those addressed by Hofstede and the GLOBE researchers to test the broader applicability of findings in earlier single country studies. For example, Bass was a long-standing proponent of transformational leadership and often claimed that transformational leadership was endorsed in many cultural contexts.[11] Others took issue with Bass on the basis that his argument regarding the cross-cultural popularity of transformational versus transactional leadership were based primarily on one country studies carried out in a single cultural context. Eventually, however, researchers such as Ardichvili collected data from multiple cultures that could be analyzed with respect to Bass' transformational-transactional leadership and other cultural dimensions.[12]

While the increase in the number and scope of multinational studies is encouraging and exciting there are still significant drawbacks with the approaches taken with respect to designing the studies and collecting and evaluating the data. As noted by Dickson et al.:

---

[10] M. Javidan, R. House, P. Dorfman, P. Hanges and M. de Luque, "Conceptualizing and measuring cultures and their consequences: A comparative review of GLOBE's and Hofstede's approaches," Journal of International Business Studies, 37(6) (2006), 897-914, 910.

[11] See, e.g., B. Bass, "Does the transactional-transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries?" American Psychologist, 1997:52(2), 130-139.

[12] See A. Ardichvili, "Leadership styles and work-related values of managers and employees of manufacturing enterprises in post-communist countries," Human Resource Development Quarterly, 2001:12(4), 363-383.

"Despite the substantial advances these studies represent, there are still significant limitations present in the majority of them. Most consider relatively few cultures or focus specifically on one region of the world. Some measure culture, others simply apply the culture dimension scores found by Hofstede or others. The measures of leadership also vary. Some focus on a specific behavior or aspect, some on ideologies or preferred leadership and some test models developed in one region of the world in another world region. Still others do not refer to leadership as such, but test attitudes and behaviors that are relevant to the understanding of leadership in different cultures. Many studies rely on surveys as their sole method."[13]

The new tools available to researchers in the cross-cultural leadership area have also allowed them to explore a number of interesting propositions and issues that have long fueled debate in the field. For example, in 1997 House et al. advanced several interesting propositions that they referred to as cultural congruence, cultural difference and the near universality of leadership behaviors.[14] Each of these propositions, which are discussed in detail below, have interesting and important consequences in relation to the way in which leaders behave and their expectations with regard to the actions of their followers in reaction to certain leadership behaviors. The GLOBE project explicitly explored the issue of universality of leadership behaviors; however, other studies have also contributed to the debate and it is reasonable to expect that the volume of research will continue to grow in the years to come particularly research on the specific role and impact of cultural differences on leadership styles and behaviors that appear to be culturally contingent. Other questions that researchers have wrestled with include gauging the effect of "globalization" on cultural differences and the rate of cultural change.

§1:2   Cultural congruence

The proposition of "cultural congruence" argued that the cultural values in the environment in which a leader is working will determine which leadership behaviors or attributes will be most effective in that environment.[15] Since it was first proposed a number of studies have been undertaken to provide evidence to support this proposition. For example, one study found that China's cultural values of conformity and tradition possibly explained why Chinese managers preferred management styles that avoided conflict while at the same time US managers, operating under achievement-oriented cultural values, tended to use competing conflict management styles.[16] Another study provided support for the relationship between cultural values and the preferred level of subordinate involvement in decisions that managers are required to make regarding strategy and operations. Specifically, managers were more likely to tap into the experience of subordinates and allow them to participate in decisions when the societal

---

[13] M. Dickson, D. Den Hartog and J. Mitchelson, "Research on leadership in a cross-cultural context: Making progress, and raising new questions," The Leadership Quarterly 14 (2003) 729-768, 751.
[14] R. House, P. Hanges and S. Ruiz-Quintanilla, "GLOBE: The global leadership and organizational behavior effectiveness research program," Polish Psychological Bulletin, 1997:28(3), 215-254.
[15] Id.
[16] M. Morris, K. Williams, K. Leung, R. Larrick, M. Mendoza, D. Bhatmager, et al., "Conflict management style: Accounting for cross-national differences," Journal of International Business Studies, 1998:29(4), 729-747.

cultural values included high individualism, cultural autonomy, egalitarianism, low power distance, harmony and femininity; however, supervisorial authority and formal rules played much bigger roles in the making of decisions—and subordinate participation was minimal or non-existent—in societies characterized by collectivism, cultural embeddedness, hierarchy, power distance, mastery and masculinity.[17]

§1:3   Cultural difference proposition

The cultural difference proposition laid out the interesting and intriguing idea that if leaders adopted behaviors and attributes that were slightly different than what was traditionally expected and accepted under the dominant cultural values of the society they would be able to encourage innovation and improvements in performance simply by introducing "change" provided that the disruption was not too radical.[18] This sort of "unconventional behavior" has been tied to the actions that leaders are encouraged to take to implement the charismatic leadership style.[19] However, there has not been much in the way of research evidence to support this proposition.

§1:4   Universality versus cultural contingency

Many researchers believe that the fundamental question in cross-cultural studies is identifying "emics" and "etics". In their words, "[e]mics are things that are unique to a culture, whereas etics are things that are universal to all cultures. Emics are by definition not comparable across cultures."[20] The foregoing explains why so much of the research done with respect to cross-cultural studies, particularly in the general area of "leadership", has focused on what things or phenomena are "universal" (i.e., etics) and what things or phenomena are "culturally contingent" (i.e., emics).[21] The quest for universality has been challenging for a number of reasons beginning with the fact that several different types of "universal relationships" have been identified in the literature[22]:

---

[17] P. Smith, M. Peterson, S. Schwartz, A. Ahmad, D. Akande, J. Andersen et al., "Cultural values, sources of guidance, and their relevance to managerial behavior—A 47-nation study," Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 2002:33(2), 188-208.

[18] R. House, P. Hanges and S. Ruiz-Quintanilla, "GLOBE: The global leadership and organizational behavior effectiveness research program," Polish Psychological Bulletin, 1997:28(3), 215-254.

[19] See, e.g., J. Conger and R. Kanungo, "Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings," Academy of Management Review, 1987:12, 637-647.

[20] G. Graen, C. Jui, M. Wakabayashi and Z. Wang, "Cross-cultural research alliances in organizational research," in P. Earley and M. Erez (Eds.), New perspectives on international industrial/organizational psychology (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1997), 160-189, 162.

[21] M. Dickson, P. Hanges and R. Lord, "Trends, developments, and gaps in cross-cultural research on leadership," in W. Mobley and M. McCall (Eds.), Advances in global leadership, vol. 2 (Stamford, CT: JAI Press, 2001).

[22] Based on M. Dickson, D. Den Hartog and J. Mitchelson, "Research on leadership in a cross-cultural context: Making progress, and raising new questions," The Leadership Quarterly 14 (2003) 729-768, 732-733. The first three types were identified in W. Lonner, "The search for psychological universals," in J. Triandis and W. Lambert (Eds.), Perspectives Handbook of cross-cultural psychology, vol. 1 (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1980) and the last two types were introduced in B. Bass, "Does the transactional-transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries?", American Psychologist, 52(2) (1997), 130-139.

- The simple universal is a thing or phenomenon that is constant throughout the world and can be generalized across cultural boundaries. For example, the general idea of "leadership" is a universal phenomenon since some form of leadership can be found in all societies and certain leadership behaviors—"encouraging," "positive," "motivational," "dynamic" and "excellence-oriented"—also appear to be viewed favorably in all countries included in large representative samples.[23]
- The variform universal is a general statement or principle that applies across all cultures but which plays out differently from culture to culture (i.e., culture moderates the relationship). For example, "organizational citizenship" exists in some form in all cultures but its enactment plays out differently depending on the cultural context.[24]
- The functional universal occurs when the "within-group" relationship between two variables is the same across cultures. For example, it has been suggested that the more that a leader engages in transformational behaviors the more effective he or she will be as a leader regardless of the cultural context and therefore leaders who develop a vision of the future and motivate their followers to work hard will be effective wherever they might be.[25]
- The variform functional universal occurs when the relationship between two variables is found in every culture but the magnitude of the relationship between the variables is different from culture to culture. For example, researchers have examined the idea that while behaviors embodying transformational leadership are meaningful in all cultural contexts their enactment is demonstrably different depending on whether the context is Eastern or Western.[26]
- The systematic behavioral universal is a theory that claims either that (a) a sequence of behavior (i.e., "if-then") is invariant in all cultures or (b) the structure and organization of a behavior or behavioral cluster is constant in all cultures.

The pursuit of universality was common in many of the earliest research efforts in the field of cross-cultural studies; however, Hofstede, among others, eventually turned the

---

[23] The leadership behaviors referenced in the text are characteristic of "transformational leadership" and were analyzed in a large study on the effectiveness of transformational behavior that was part of the GLOBE research program.

[24] See J. Farh, P. Earley and S. Lin, "Impetus for action: A cultural analysis of justice and organizational citizenship behavior in Chinese society," Administrative Science Quarterly, 42 (1997), 421-444 (describing how enactment of organizational citizenship is different in an Asian context).

[25] B. Bass, "Does the transactional-transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries?" American Psychologist, 52(2) (1997), 130-139 (citing research supporting the effectiveness of transformational leadership in India, Japan, New Zealand and Singapore). Another study of the impact of transformational leadership on teachers' commitment to change found similarities in North America and Hong Kong; however, the magnitude of the impact was much less among teachers in Hong Kong. See H. Yu, K. Leithwood and D. Jantzi, "The effects of transformational leadership on teachers' commitment to change in Hong Kong," Journal of Educational Administration, 40(4/5) (2002), 368-390.

[26] See G. Spreitzer, K. Perttula and K. Xin, "Traditionality Matters: An Examination of the Effectiveness of Transformational Leadership in the U.S. and Taiwan," http://webuser.bus.umich.edu/spreitze/traditionalitymatters.pdf [accessed July 21, 2010]. See also D. Jung, B. Bass and J. Sosik, "Bridging leadership and culture: A theoretical consideration of transformational leadership and collectivist cultures," The Journal of Leadership Studies, 2 (1995), 3-18 (suggesting that transformational leadership is generalizable but that it is more important in societies that can be categorized as "collectivist" since followers in those societies are more comfortable with the recommended focus of transformational leaders on collective mission, goals and responsibilities).

discussion in a different direction through his efforts to demonstrate that "culture matters" when predicting the efficacy of leadership styles and management practices. Universality of leadership behaviors was of particular interest to the GLOBE researchers and House et al. laid out the "near universality of leadership behaviors proposition", which held that there are leadership attributes that are either universally accepted as effective or universally perceived as impediments to effective leadership, regardless of the cultural values of the specific society.[27] A number of studies, particularly the GLOBE project, focused on testing this proposition and results seemed to support the proposition although the research also confirmed that the effect of a much wider array of leadership attributes is culturally contingent.[28]

Supporters of the cultural contingency approach argue that leadership theories that originate in the Anglo-American culture may not be universally applicable in countries with different cultural orientation because those theories are grounded in and defined by the Western values of the persons who came up with and popularized the theories. In fact, there is a good deal of research that supports cultural contingency in the area of leadership—persons with different cultural values do perceive and react to leadership styles and methods differently. For example, one group of researchers concluded that certain transformational leadership styles that are popular and appear to be successful in Western cultures would not be effective in Columbia, India or the Middle East and that a leader in those countries would be better off deploying leadership behaviors that are directive and less involved with followers.[29] Differences in the effectiveness of leadership styles between cultures were also uncovered in a number of studies conducted as part of the GLOBE project. For example, Den Hartog et al. found universal endorsement of several attributes of charismatic/transformational leadership as being associated with outstanding leadership (i.e., integrity, charisma, inspirational and visionary) and universal condemnation of other attributes (i.e., irritability, noncooperativeness, egocentric, being a loner, ruthlessness and dictatorial) as inhibiting effective leadership; however, they also found that endorsement of other attributes varied significantly along cultural lines.[30]

---

[27] R. House, P. Hanges and S. Ruiz-Quintanilla, "GLOBE: The global leadership and organizational behavior effectiveness research program," Polish Psychological Bulletin, 1997:28(3), 215-254.

[28] For further discussion, see the chapter on "Universality versus Cultural Contingency" in "Cross-Cultural Leadership Studies" in "Leadership: A Library of Resources for Sustainable Entrepreneurs" prepared and distributed by the Sustainable Entrepreneurship Project (www.seproject.org).

[29] R. Pillai, T. Scandura and E. Williams, "Are there universal models of leadership and organizational justice? An investigation of the U.S., Australia, India, Columbia, and the Middle East", Journal of International Business Studies (1997).

[30] See generally D. Den Hartog, R. House, P. Hanges, S. Ruiz-Quintanilla, P. Dorfman and Globe Associates, "Culture specific and cross-culturally generalizable implicit leadership theories: Are attributes of charismatic/transformational leadership universally endorsed?" Leadership Quarterly (Special issue: Charismatic and Transformational Leadership: Taking Stock of the Present and Future (Part I), 10(2) (1999), 219-256. See also P. Dorfman, P. Hanges and F. Brodbeck, "Leadership prototypes and cultural variation: The identification of culturally endorsed implicit theories of leadership," in R. House, P. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. Dorfman and V. Gupta (eds.), Culture, leadership and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies (Thousand Oaks: Sage, 2004) ("charismatic/value-based" leadership was more likely to be endorsed in societies where cultural values included strong in-group collectivism and humane orientation, two of the cultural dimensions assessed in the GLOBE project).

Chapter 2
Universality versus Cultural Contingency

§2:1   Introduction

One of the fundamental goals of cross-cultural research relating to leadership is to determine whether attributes of leadership are perceived in the same way—positively or negatively—across all societal cultures (i.e., universally) or whether the perception of those attributes varied across the range of societal cultures ("culturally contingent"). The universalistic perspective is based on the proposition that although there are probably some differences across cultures with respect to leadership in general there are more similarities such that it is appropriate to expect that leaders around the world will rely upon a common toolkit of management practices and structures. Proponents of this view point to a variety of factors that they believe support their position including common technological imperatives and industrial logic and the emergence of global technologies and institutions[31], as well as arguments that factors such as heredity and personality traits place universal constraints on how items such as culture and training can change how leaders think and act.[32] They also argue that forces of modernization and globalization are fueling a movement toward cultural congruence with respect to organizational and business practices and that leaders everywhere are now more concerned with dealing with contingencies that supersede cultural factors including larger and more complex organizations, rapidly changing technologies, designing and implementing strategies that are increasingly global and coping with environmental instabilities that impact all countries at the same time.[33] As for those studies that claim to have identified observable differences across cultural boundaries, the "universalists" argue that in many instances those findings are due to research design limitations, unmatched sampling and the like and that the actual level of the "pure" influence of cultural factors on leadership is probably negligible and insignificant.[34]   In contrast, supporters of the cultural contingency position believe strongly that "the values, beliefs, norms, and ideals that are

---

[31] D. Carl and M. Javidan, Universality of Charismatic Leadership: A Multi-Nation Study. Paper presented at the Academy of Management Proceedings (2001).

[32] See, e.g., A. Johnson, P. Vernon, M. Molson, J. Harris and K. Jang, Born to Lead: A Behavior Genetic Investigation of Leadership Ability, Paper presented at the Society for Industrial Organization Psychology, Dallas, TX (1998) (40 to 50 percent of variance in leadership behaviors of monozygotic twins could be attributed to heritability); and B. Bass, "Does the Transactional-Transformational Leadership Paradigm Transcend Organizational and National Boundaries?", American Psychologist, 52(2) (1997), 130-139 (leadership requires a disposition to be "influential", a trait that arguably transcends cultural boundaries and also is difficult to "train").

[33] C. Kerr, The Future of Industrial Societies: Convergence or Continuing Diversity. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983); and P. Blyton, "The General and the Particular in Cross-National Comparative Research", Applied Psychology: An International Review, 50(4) (2001), 590-595.

[34] H. Zagoršek, Assessing the impact of national culture on leadership: A six nation study (September 2004) miha.ef.uni-lj.si/_dokumenti/wp/zagoršek-članek.doc [accessed February 16, 2011]

embedded in a culture affect leadership behavior and goals, as well as structure, culture, and strategies of organizations".[35]

Initial interviews with managers from various countries elicited responses that suggested to the researchers involved in the Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness ("GLOBE") project that culture was indeed an important factor in whether or not a particular leadership "attribute", or "style", would be effective with followers in a particular society. The GLOBE researchers set out to formally examine universality versus cultural contingency in more detail by identifying a large number of possible attributes of leaders and polling respondents around the world about whether these attributes contributed to the effectiveness of a leader or inhibited the ability of a leader to be effective and successful. The survey was intended to address the long-standing debate surrounding the following three key research questions:

- Are there one or more attributes that are universally perceived as contributors to outstanding leadership—if present these attributes would be considered to be "universal positive leader attributes"?
- Are there one or more attributes that are universally perceived as inhibitors of outstanding leadership—if present these attributes would be considered to be "universal negative leader attributes"?
- Are there one or more attributes that have an effect that is "culture specific", meaning that in some societies they are perceived as contributors to outstanding leadership while in other societies they are perceived as inhibitors of outstanding leadership—if present these attributes would be considered to be "culturally contingent leadership attributes"?

The leadership questionnaires designed by the GLOBE researchers included over 100 behavioral and attribute descriptors that the survey designers hypothesized as either contributing to a person's ability to be an outstanding leader or inhibited a person's ability to be an outstanding leader. Each of the participants (i.e., thousands of middle managers from hundreds of organizations distributed among over 60 countries) were asked to rate each of the descriptors on a scale of 1-to-7 with a rating of "1" meaning that the behavior or attribute greatly inhibiting a person from being an outstanding leader and a rating of "7" meaning that the behavior or attribute greatly contributed to a person being an outstanding leader.[36]

While universality was a long-debated topic there was frequent disagreement about the standards that should be applied in forging an objective and workable definition of "universal". Recognizing this issue the GLOBE researchers set a fairly high bar for

---

[35] Id. See also, e.g., K. Newman and S. Nollen, "Culture and Congruence: The Fit between Management Practices and National Culture", Journal of International Business Studies, 27(4) (1996), 753-780 ("National culture is a central organizing principle of employees' understanding of work, their approach to it, and the way in which they expect to be treated. National culture implies that one way of action or one set of outcomes is preferable to another.").

[36] R. House, P. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. Dorfman and V. Gupta (Eds), Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies (Thousand Oaks CA: Sage, 2004).

"universal endorsement". For example, an attribute could not be included among the universal positive leader attributes unless each of the following two requirements were satisfied: (1) at least 95% of the societal averages of the scores for that attribute had to exceed a mean of 5 on a scale going from 1 at the lowest to 7 at the highest, and (2) the grand mean score on a worldwide basis for that attributes, including all of the societal cultures, had to exceed 6 on the 1-to-7 measurement scale. The requirements were necessarily different yet similar for inclusion among the universal negative leader attributes—(1) at least 95% of the societal averages of the scores for that attribute had to be less than a mean of 3 on the 1-to-7 measurement scale, and (2) the grand mean score on a worldwide basis for that attributes, including all of the societal cultures, had to be less than 3 on the 1-to-7 scale. In order for an attribute to be "culturally contingent" it had to have societal average scores that were both above and below the midpoint of 4.[37]

As they approached the issue of effective leadership behaviors the GLOBE researchers relied heavily on a body of research known as "implicit leadership theory" which is based on the proposition that individuals around the world, regardless of their societal or cultural environment, gradually develop a set of beliefs regarding behaviors and characteristics of leaders beginning from a very early age and that as they grow older these beliefs become so engrained that they are often applied without any conscious awareness by the individual (i.e., they become "implicit").[38] One of the important things to understand about implicit leadership theory is that the "followers", rather than the "leaders", set the rules and determine the characteristics that distinguish leaders from non-leaders and the leadership styles that separate effective and ineffective leaders.[39] A second key element of all this is the assumption that individuals within an interacting group—a society, a community, an organization or a team—share similar implicit leadership theories because they typically share other things that contribute to a common "view of the world" including their general environment, recent experiences, challenges and successes, core values, education, religious beliefs and the like. Testing this assumption was one of the main initial goals of the GLOBE researchers as they attempted to collect and present evidence that each organizational or societal culture would have its own specific ideas and beliefs regarding leadership styles and behaviors including what

---

[37] Id. at 677-679.

[38] For further discussion of implicit leadership theories, see B. Schyns and J. Meindl (Eds). Implicit Leadership Theories: Essays and Explorations (Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, 2005) and R. Lord and K. Maher, Leadership and information processing: Linking perceptions and performance (Boston: Unwin-Everyman, 1991).

[39] The GLOBE researchers explained the major assertions of implicit leadership theory as follows: "Leadership qualities are attributed to individuals, and those persons are accepted as leaders, on the basis of the degree of fit, or congruence, between the leader behaviors they enact and the implicit leadership theory held by the attributers. Implicit leadership theories constrain, moderate, and guide the exercise of leadership, the acceptance of leaders, the perception of leaders as influential, acceptable, and effective, and the degree to which leaders are granted status and privileges." See R. House, P. Hanges, S. Ruiz-Quintanilla, P. Dorfman, M. Javidan and M. Dickson, "Cultural Influences on Leadership and Organizations," Advances in Global Leadership, Volume I (Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, Inc., 1999), 171-233.

attributes are considered to be acceptable and effective and what attributes are considered to be impediments to effective leadership and thus unacceptable.[40]

Again, it is important to emphasize that the while the leadership "attributes" identified by the GLOBE researchers were important to the extent that they could be analyzed as "facilitators" or "inhibitors" of effective leadership, the attributes should not be confused with leadership itself. Identification of the attributes as "universal" or "culturally contingent" provides useful guidance to those seeking to "lead" within organizations, regardless of the level at which they are operating. Specifically, leaders everywhere should strive for those "universal" attributes that facilitate leadership effectiveness, such as being trustworthy, planning ahead, being positive and motivating, building confidence, being communicative and being a coordinator and team integrator. At the same time, all leaders should steer clear of the "universal impediments" to their effectiveness, including being a loner and asocial, being non-cooperative and irritable and being dictatorial. The cultural context should determine whether or not other "culturally contingent" attributes described below, such as individualism, status consciousness or risk taking, would be effective for a leader in a specific cultural context.[41]

§2:2   Universal positives

The GLOBE researchers identified the following 22 attributes that satisfied the requirements for classification as one of the "universal positives"[42]:

Encouraging
Positive
Dynamic
Motive arouser
Confidence builder
Motivational
Communicative
Informed
Coordinator
Team builder
Trustworthy
Just
Honest
Foresight
Plans ahead

---

[40] C. Grove, Leadership Style Variations Across Cultures: Overview of GLOBE Research Findings (Grovewell LLC: Grovewell.com/GLOBE, 2005), http://www.grovewell.com/pub-GLOBE-leadership.html [accessed September 2, 2010].

[41] For further discussion of leadership "attributes" identified by the GLOBE researchers, see M. Javidan, P. Dorfman, M. de Luque and R. House, "In the eye of the beholder: Cross cultural lessons in leadership from Project GLOBE", Academy of Management Perspectives, February 2006, 67-90.

[42] R. House, P. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. Dorfman and V. Gupta (Eds), Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies (Thousand Oaks CA: Sage, 2004). Table 21.2 at 677.

Effective bargainer
Win-win problem solver
Dependable
Intelligent
Decisive
Administratively skilled
Excellence oriented

It should not be forgotten that while an attribute might be universally endorsed and appreciated the steps that a leader needs to take in order to express these attributes successfully and effectively may vary significantly between societies based on their specific dominant cultural dimensions. For example, a leader is considered to be "decisive" in the US if he or she makes quick and approximate decisions; however, in countries such as a France and Germany the approved and expected process for decisiveness among leaders includes much higher levels of deliberation and precision than in the US.[43]

While the results of the GLOBE study are the primary focus of the current discussion, it should be noted that several studies using relatively small groups of countries, three to five, from different parts of the world also identified universal support within those groups for various leadership attributes such as leadership supportiveness, contingent reward, charisma, participative leadership, supportive leadership, directive leadership, low neuroticism and high extroversion.[44]

§2:3   Universal negatives

The GLOBE researchers identified the following eight attributes that satisfied the requirements for classification as one of the "universal negatives"[45]:

Loner
Asocial
Non-cooperative
Irritable

---

[43] M. Hoppe, "Culture and Leader Effectiveness: The GLOBE Study", September 2007, http://www.inspireimagineinnovate.com/PDF/GLOBEsummary-by-Michael-H-Hoppe.pdf [accessed September 15, 2010]

[44] See P. Dorfman, J. Howell, S. Hibino, J. Lee, U. Tate and A. Bautista, "Leadership in Western and Asian countries: Commonalities and differences in effective leadership processes across cultures", The Leadership Quarterly, 8(3) (1997), 233–274 (endorsement of leadership supportiveness, contingent reward and charisma in Japan, Korea, Mexico, Taiwan and the US); R. Mehta, T. Larsen, B. Rosenbloom, J. Mazur and P. Polsa, "Leadership and cooperation in marketing channels: A comparative empirical analysis of the USA, Finland and Poland," International Marketing Review, 18(6) (2001), 633-667 (endorsement of participative, supportive and directive leadership); and C. Silverthorne, "Leadership effectiveness and personality: A cross-cultural evaluation," Personality and Individual Differences, 30(2) (2001), 303-309 (endorsement of low neuroticism and high extroversion in China, Thailand and the US).

[45] R. House, P. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. Dorfman and V. Gupta (Eds), Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies (Thousand Oaks CA: Sage, 2004). Table 21.3 at 678.

Non-explicit
Dictatorial
Egocentric
Ruthless

Again, as is the case with the universal positive attributes listed above, the perception of whether particular behaviors express one of the universal negatives will vary between societies based on their specific dominant cultural dimensions. For example, the threshold for acting what is perceived negatively as "dictatorial" may be much higher in strong power distance societies where followers are more conditioned to firm and authoritative leadership practices while followers in lower power distance societies could be expected to be much more sensitive to autocratic or arbitrary actions by persons in a position to exercise control over them.[46]

§2:4   Culturally contingent attributes

One of the many important contributions of the GLOBE project to cross-cultural research in general, as well as the study of cross-cultural leadership in particular, was the evidence to support a finding that a leader's effectiveness is determined in large part by the context in which he or she is operating and the societal and organizational cultural values and beliefs of those persons following the leader.

The GLOBE researchers identified the following 35 attributes that satisfied the requirements for classification as one of the "culturally contingent leadership attributes". The list of these attributes along with the lowest and highest societal average score for that attribute is as follows[47]:

Able to anticipate (3.84 - 6.51)	Intuitive (3.72 - 6.47)
Ambitious (2.85 - 6.73)	Logical (3.89 - 6.58)
Autonomous (1.63 - 5.17)	Micro-manager (1.60 - 5.00)
Cautious (2.17 - 5.78)	Orderly (3.81 - 6.34)
Class conscious (2.53 - 6.09)	Procedural (3.03 - 6.10)
Compassionate (2.69 - 5.56)	Provocateur (1.38 - 6.00)
Cunning (1.26 - 6.38)	Risk taker (2.14 - 5.96)
Domineering (1.60 - 5.14)	Ruler (1.66 - 5.20)
Elitist (1.61 - 5.00)	Self-effacing (1.85 – 5.23)
Enthusiastic (3.72 - 6.44)	Self-sacrificial (3.00 - 5.96)

---

[46] M. Hoppe, "Culture and Leader Effectiveness: The GLOBE Study", September 2007, http://www.inspireimagineinnovate.com/PDF/GLOBEsummary-by-Michael-H-Hoppe.pdf [accessed September 15, 2010]

[47] R. House, P. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. Dorfman and V. Gupta (Eds), Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies (Thousand Oaks CA: Sage, 2004), Table 21.4 at 679. See also D. Den Hartog, R. House, P. Hanges, S. Ruiz-Quintanilla, P. Dorfman and Globe Associates, "Culture specific and cross-culturally generalizable implicit leadership theories: Are attributes of charismatic/transformational leadership universally endorsed?" Leadership Quarterly (Special issue: Charismatic and Transformational Leadership: Taking Stock of the Present and Future (Part I), 10(2) (1999), 219-256.

Evasive (1.52 – 5.67)	Sensitive (1.96 - 6.35)
Formal (2.12 - 5.43)	Sincere (3.99 - 6.55)
Habitual (1.93 - 5.38)	Status-conscious (1.92 - 5.77)
Independent (1.67 - 5.32)	Subdued (1.32 - 6.18)
Indirect (2.16 – 4.86)	Unique (3.47 - 6.06)
Individualistic (1.67 - 5.10)	Willful (3.06 - 6.48)
Intra-group competitor (3.00 - 6.49)	Worldly (3.48 - 6.18)
Intra-group conflict avoider (1.84 -5.69)	

When reviewing the range of scores it is important to remember that a score of 1 meant that the attribute greatly inhibited outstanding business leadership and a score of 7 meant that the attribute greatly contributed to outstanding business leadership. For example, attitudes regarding the attribute of ambition were culturally contingent with mean scores across all of the societal cultures included in the survey running from 2.85 – 6.73 on a scale on which a score of 1 meant that ambition greatly inhibits outstanding business leadership and score of 7 meant that ambition greatly contributes to outstanding business leadership. Similarly, attitudes regarding the attribute of cunning were culturally contingent with mean scores across all of the societal cultures included in the survey running from 1.26 – 6.38 on a scale on which a score of 1 meant that being cunning greatly inhibits outstanding business leadership and score of 7 meant that being cunning greatly contributes to outstanding business leadership.

The range of societal average scores for each of the culturally contingent leadership attributes can be explained, in part, by the cultural characteristics of the various societies. For example, attitudes toward risk taking by leaders, which has a range of 2.14 – 5.96, will likely be significantly impacted by a society's position on the continuum for the cultural dimension of uncertainty avoidance and followers in strong uncertainty avoidance societies will understandably have misgiving about leaders who appear to be behaving and managing in what locals perceive as an excessively risky manner.[48] Similarly, the effectiveness of certain leadership attributes will vary depending upon the feelings with a society regarding what is appropriate with respect to showing and expressing emotions. In "affective" societies people show their emotions and appreciate outwardly enthusiastic leaders who communicate using vivid and temporal expressions of emotion. In contrast, people tended to hide or manage their emotions in more "neutral" societies and present themselves in a manner that was more composed and subdued.[49]

§2:5   Additional studies

---

[48] M. Hoppe, "Culture and Leader Effectiveness: The GLOBE Study", September 2007, http://www.inspireimagineinnovate.com/PDF/GLOBEsummary-by-Michael-H-Hoppe.pdf [accessed September 15, 2010]

[49] D. Den Hartog, R. House, P. Hanges, S. Ruiz-Quintanilla, P. Dorfman and Globe Associates, "Culture specific and cross-culturally generalizable implicit leadership theories: Are attributes of charismatic/transformational leadership universally endorsed?" Leadership Quarterly (Special issue: Charismatic and Transformational Leadership: Taking Stock of the Present and Future (Part I), 10(2) (1999), 219-256. See also F. Trompenaars and C. Hampden-Turner, Riding the waves of culture: understanding cultural diversity in business (2nd ed.) (London: Nicholas Breale, 1997) (describing researching confirming that displays of emotion may be interpreted as a lack of control or weakness).

Recognition and identification of culturally contingent leadership attributes created a large and intriguing reservoir for additional research to understand more fully why certain attributes are perceived differently across societies. One illustration is the examination by Aditya and House of the characteristics of leaders that represented a need for "interpersonal acumen" and their comparison of how different cultures rated these characteristics as contributors to outstanding leadership.[50] Among the characteristics examined were cunning, indirect communication, evasive behaviors and sensitivity and the contrasts between societies were quite interesting. For example, cunning was cited by leaders in Columbia as contributing to outstanding leadership while leaders in Switzerland viewed cunning, or behaving in a sly or deceitful fashion, as inhibiting outstanding leadership. Cultural differences were also apparent when examining the feelings of leaders on the other characteristics. Another factor related to interpersonal acumen is "communication style" and leaders must be mindful of how followers in a particular culture expect to receive information and direction from those in authority. Hofstede's power distance dimension is relevant to this issue and it has been suggested that communication is mostly one-way, top to bottom, in high power distance societies and that it is expected that leaders will know more than their subordinates and that input from subordinates will neither be solicited nor welcomed.[51]

The results of other studies seemed to support the proposition of cultural contingency, although the research also confirmed that the effect of a much wider array of leadership attributes is culturally contingent[52]:

- A study of managerial skills in seven European countries and the US identified two skills—"drive for results" and "analyze issues"—as universally recognized as being critical for success; however, several other skills were not endorsed across the board and overall the study provided limited support for the universality of leadership skill dimensions.[53]
- A study of midlevel managers in the US, China and Thailand partially supported universality by finding the effective leaders in each of the countries shared low neuroticism and high extroversion; however, the relationship between three other

---

[50] R. Aditya and R. House, "Interpersonal acumen and leadership across cultures: Pointers from the GLOBE study", in R. Riggio and S. Murphy (Eds.), Multiple intelligences and leadership (Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 2002).

[51] See also M. Javidan and R. House, "Cultural acumen for the global manager: Lessons from Project GLOBE," Organizational Dynamics, 29(4) (2001), 289-305.

[52] Based in part on summaries of the work of various cross-cultural leadership researchers appearing in M. Dickson, D. Den Hartog and J. Mitchelson, "Research on leadership in a cross-cultural context: Making progress, and raising new questions," The Leadership Quarterly 14 (2003) 729-768, 733-734.

[53] See C. Robie, K. Johnson, D. Nilsen and J. Hazucha, "The right stuff: Understanding cultural differences in leadership performance," Journal of Management Development, 20(7) (2001), 639–650. Another study involving European managers, as well as managers from the US, identified several other attributes and skills associated with effective leadership including valuing personal influence, cooperation and acceptance of rules and procedures established by an external authority. See J. Lesley and E. Van Velsor, A cross-national comparison of effective leadership and teamwork: Toward a global workforce (Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership, 1998).

personality factors—high agreeableness, high conscientiousness and high openness to experience—and effectiveness was culturally contingent.[54]

- Researchers studying managers and professionals in Japan, Korea, Mexico, Taiwan and the US found endorsement of three leadership behaviors of supervisors in every country—leader supportiveness, contingent reward and charismatic leadership; however, the effects of three other behaviors—participative leadership, directive leadership and contingent punishment—were culturally contingent in different ways. For example, contingent punishment only worked well in the US, participative leadership only had positive effects in Korea and the US and directive leadership was the preferred approach in Mexico and Taiwan.[55]

As research continues and more and more attention is paid to non-Western countries[56] it appears that a consensus is growing that both the simple universal and culture contingent perspectives are relevant to cross-cultural studies and, in fact, there has been a decided decline in the volume of research focusing primarily on identifying simple universals. Some studies indicate that some specified leadership behaviors achieve universal acceptance while others are endorsed in only certain cultures.[57] Other studies conclude that there are universally accepted behaviors but that their effectiveness in a particular context depends on applying them in ways that are specifically tailored to national cultural values and certain behaviors, while widely deployed, are used more frequently in some cultural settings than others.[58] Assuming these findings have some validity the challenge for leaders is to not only assess the universality of a particular behavior but to also acknowledge that even "universals" must be applied in a culturally specific manner

---

[54] See C. Silverthorne, "Leadership effectiveness and personality: A cross cultural evaluation," Personality and Individual Differences, 30(2) (2001), 303–309. High agreeableness and high conscientiousness correlated with effectiveness in the US and China but not in Thailand and a correlation between high openness to experience and effectiveness was found only in the US.

[55] See P. Dorfman, J. Howell, S. Hibino, J. Lee, U. Tate and A. Bautista, "Leadership in Western and Asian countries: Commonalities and differences in effective leadership processes across cultures," The Leadership Quarterly, 8(3) (1997), 233–274.

[56] One of the main criticisms of much of the research conducted in the area of cross-cultural studies has been that it has had a Western bias and fails to recognize culture specific non-Western cultural models. For example, relatively little work has been done to build new models from the unique vantage point of a non-Western culture and many of the studies of non-Western cultures are conducted primarily to assess whether one or more elements of a Western cultural model might be applicable in different contexts (e.g., a set of behaviors known to occur in Western countries is selected in advance and then research is done using a sample of Western and non-Western countries). M. Dickson, D. Den Hartog and J. Mitchelson, "Research on leadership in a cross-cultural context: Making progress, and raising new questions," The Leadership Quarterly 14 (2003) 729-768, 734.

[57] See, e.g., B. Bass, Bass and Stodgill's Handbook of Leadership (3d Ed.) (New York: Free Press, 1990) (study of two Western and three Asian countries found that while leader supportiveness and charisma, two behaviors generally associated with transformational leadership, appeared to be universally endorsed in all five countries only the Western countries had a positive reaction to two other transformational leadership behaviors: participativeness and directiveness. See also P. Dorfman and J. Howell, "Leadership in Western and Asian countries: commonalities and differences in effective leadership processes across cultures," Leadership Quarterly 8(3) (1997), 233-267 (arguing that research indicates that commonalities and differences do exist across cultures with respect to effective leadership processes).

[58] See, e.g., K. Boehnke, N. Bontis, J. DiStefano and A. DiStefano, "Transformational leadership: An examination of cross-cultural differences and similarities," Leadership and Organization Development Journal, 24 (2003), 5-15 (team building behaviors used more frequently in the US than in the Far East).

in order to achieve optimal effectiveness. In fact, the state of affairs from a research perspective has been fairly summarized in the following passage by M.W. Dickson et al.: ". . . we have begun to recognize that variform and variform functional universals can be simultaneously universal and culturally contingent in a predictable way, as when the variation in the enactment of a common characteristic or the strength of a common relationship is determined by measurable characteristics of the cultures."[59] Research activities now focus on identifying differences between cultures with respect to values, characteristics and relationships that conform to or can be explained by the various cultural dimensions that have been suggested and which are described below and elsewhere in this Library.[60]

---

[59] M. Dickson, D. Den Hartog and J. Mitchelson, "Research on leadership in a cross-cultural context: Making progress, and raising new questions," The Leadership Quarterly 14 (2003) 729-768, 734.

[60] The interest in and acceptance of cultural dimensions has grown along with the volume of information that has been collected regarding managerial practices and leadership styles in non-Western countries that have grown to challenge the economic supremacy of the US and other Western countries. For example, paternalism is a leadership style that is valued in many emerging countries and thus must be recognized and understood even if it is not widely endorsed by management consultants advising businesses in the US. See P. Dorfman and J. Howell, "Dimensions of national culture and effective leadership patterns," Advances in International Comparative Management, 3 (1988), 127-150.

Chapter 3
GLOBE Project Leadership Theory Dimensions

§3:1   Introduction

The researchers involved in the Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness ("GLOBE") project identified a large number of potential "attributes" of organizational leaders and polled respondents around the world to determine whether these attributes contributed to the effectiveness of a leader or inhibited the ability of a leader to be effective and successful.[61]   Based on statistical analysis of the responses the GLOBE researchers identified 21 "primary leadership dimensions" (sometimes called "first order factors") that all of the societal cultures in the survey appeared to agree were contributors to either effective or ineffective leadership. These dimensions are included in the following table ranked from the most universally desirable to the least universally desirable based on their "world mean", which is the average of the mean scores for that dimension for all of the societal cultures on the 1-to-7 measurement scale[62]:

Integrity (6.07)	Humane orientation (4.78)
Charismatic/Inspirational (6.07)	Status consciousness (4.34)
Charismatic/Visionary (6.02)	Conflict inducer (3.97)
Performance oriented (6.02)	Procedural (3.87)
Team integrator (5.88)	Autonomous (3.85)
Decisive (5.80)	Face saver (2.92)
Administratively competent (5.76)	Non-participative (2.66)
Diplomatic (5.49)	Autocratic (2.65)
Team collaborative (5.46)	Self-centered (2.17)
Charismatic/Self-sacrificial (5.0)	Malevolent (1.80)
Modesty (4.98)	

It is important to emphasize that the list of primary leadership dimensions is not a list of attributes of an outstanding leader—in fact several of the dimensions/attributes on the list, particularly those with a "world mean" score below 3, are included because of widespread belief that they can significantly impair a leader's ability to influence, motivate and enable his or her subordinates to contribute to the success of the organization that the leader oversees.

It is also important to understand that each of the primary leadership dimensions represents a bundling of two to four of the larger number of original attributes identified by the GLOBE researchers. For example, specific attributes of a leader who is

---

[61] For detailed discussion of the various leadership attributes identified and assessed by the GLOBE researchers, see the chapter on "Universality versus Cultural Contingency" in "Cross-Cultural Leadership Studies" in "Leadership: A Library of Resources for Sustainable Entrepreneurs" prepared and distributed by the Sustainable Entrepreneurship Project (www.seproject.org).

[62] R. House, P. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. Dorfman and V. Gupta (Eds), Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies (Thousand Oaks CA: Sage, 2004), 131.

"administratively competent" would include things such as orderly, administratively skilled, organized and being a good administrator. Another illustration would be the attributes for "decisive" including willful, decisive, logical and intuitive. A "face saver" is indirect, avoids negatives and evasive.[63]

The GLOBE researchers used further statistical analysis to identify the primary leadership dimension to which each of the 22 universal positives listed above had the strongest relationship. The list of universal positives and corresponding primary leadership dimensions is as follows[64]:

Universally Positive Attributes	Primary Leadership Dimension
Encouraging	Charismatic/inspirational
Positive	Charismatic/inspirational
Dynamic	Charismatic/inspirational
Motive arouser	Charismatic/inspirational
Confidence builder	Charismatic/inspirational
Motivational	Charismatic/inspirational
Communicative	Team integrator
Informed	Team integrator
Coordinator	Team integrator
Team builder	Team integrator
Trustworthy	Integrity
Just	Integrity
Honest	Integrity
Foresight	Charismatic/visionary
Plans ahead	Charismatic/visionary
Effective bargainer	Diplomatic
Win-win problem solver	Diplomatic
Dependable	Malevolent (reverse score)
Intelligent	Malevolent
Decisive	Decisiveness
Administratively skilled	Administratively competent
Excellence oriented	Performance oriented

It is interesting to note that of the 22 attributes more than half of them were strongly linked to three of the primary leadership dimensions—charismatic/inspirational (6), team integrator (4) and integrity (3). This finding provides support for the proposition that these three dimensions and their associated attributes are widely endorsed across all societal cultures as contributing to acceptable and effective leadership behavior.

---

[63] A full list of the 21 dimensions and the associated attributes can be found in R. House, P. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. Dorfman and V. Gupta (Eds), Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies (Thousand Oaks CA: Sage, 2004), Table 8.4 at 131.
[64] Id., Table 21.2 at 677.

The GLOBE researchers used further statistical analysis to identify the primary leadership dimension to which each of the eight universal negatives listed above had the strongest relationship. The list of universal negatives and corresponding primary leadership dimensions is as follows[65]:

Universally Negative Attributes	Primary Leadership Dimensions
Loner	Self-protective
Asocial	Self-protective
Non-cooperative	Malevolent
Irritable	Malevolent
Non-explicit	Face saver
Dictatorial	Autocratic
Egocentric	None
Ruthless	None

The GLOBE researchers grouped the 21 primary leadership dimensions discussed above into six culturally endorsed leadership theory dimensions based on further statistical analysis and explained them as follows: "These dimensions are summary indices of the characteristics, skills, and abilities culturally perceived to contribute to, or inhibit, outstanding leadership."[66] The researchers noted that these dimensions can be thought of as being somewhat similar to what laypersons refer to as "leadership styles" and others have referred to the dimensions as "global leadership dimensions", "global leader behaviors" or "second order factors". The following table describes the six culturally endorsed leadership theory dimensions using the applicable primary leadership dimensions (with the exception of "autonomous" which is described using questionnaire items) and also includes the lowest and highest societal average score for that dimension on the 1-to-7 measurement scale[67]:

Charismatic/Value Based (4.5 - 6.5)	Team Oriented (4.8 - 6.2)
• Charismatic/Visionary	• Collaborative Team Orientation
• Charismatic/Inspirational	• Team Integrator
• Charismatic/Self-sacrifice	• Diplomatic
• Integrity	• Malevolent (reverse scored)
• Decisive	• Administratively competent
• Performance oriented	
Self-Protective (2.6 – 4.6)	**Participative** (4.5 – 6.1)
• Self-centered	• Autocratic (reverse scored)
• Status conscious	• Non-participative (reverse scored)
• Conflict inducer	
• Face saver	
• Procedural	

---

[65] Id., Table 21.3 at 678.

[66] Id. at 675.

[67] Id., Table 21.1 at 676.

Humane (3.8 – 5.6)	Autonomous (2.3 - 4.7)
• Modesty • Humane orientation	• Individualistic • Independent • Autonomous • Unique

The GLOBE researchers concluded that the information collected during the survey provided evidence that the six global leadership dimensions of culturally endorsed implicit theories of leadership are significantly correlated with isomorphic dimensions of societal and organizational culture and that selected cultural differences strongly influence important ways in which people think about leaders and norms concerning the status, influence, and privileges granted to leaders.[68] The GLOBE researchers found strong support for their hypothesis that charismatic/value-based leadership would be universally endorsed. In addition, a strong correlation between team-oriented leadership and charismatic/value-based leadership was identified and team-oriented leadership was also universally endorsed. Humane and participative leadership dimensions were nearly universally endorsed; however, the endorsement of self-protective and autonomous leadership varied by culture.[69]

These six culturally endorsed leadership theory dimensions are just that—dimensions or continua that can be used to evaluate how societal cultures from around the world perceive the acceptability and effectiveness of leadership behaviors. The dimensions are not intended to be universally-accepted statements of what makes an outstanding leader nor do the dimensions provide practical guidance for leaders as to how they should act on a day-to-day basis so that their followers will recognize them as skilled practitioners of the attributes associated with the preferred behaviors. In fact, the way that these dimensions play out in the "real world" depends on a number of things including the cultural context and a good deal of the analysis undertaken in relation to the GLOBE project data is concerned with how the GLOBE cultural dimensions (i.e., performance orientation, power distance, assertiveness etc.) relate to the leadership dimensions in the various societal clusters.[70]

The work of the GLOBE researchers has provided the foundation for a number of other culturally-based models of leadership. For example, Muczyk and Holt prescribed that global leaders should adapt to changing economic conditions, particularly the growing intensity of globalization, by aligning their leadership styles and processes with cultural demands.[71] They want on to suggest a "global framework of leadership" by mapping the

---

[68] R. House, P. Hanges, S. Ruiz-Quintanilla, P. Dorfman, M. Javidan and M. Dickson, "Cultural Influences on Leadership and Organizations," Advances in Global Leadership, Volume I (Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, Inc., 1999), 171-233.

[69] Id.

[70] C. Grove, Leadership Style Variations Across Cultures: Overview of GLOBE Research Findings (Grovewell LLC: Grovewell.com/GLOBE, 2005), http://www.grovewell.com/pub-GLOBE-leadership.html [accessed September 2, 2010].

[71] J. Muczyk and D. Holt, "Toward a Cultural Contingency Model of Leadership", Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 14(4) (May 2008), 277-286, 278 and 281 (citing also F. Walumbwa, J. Lawler and B. Avolio, "Leadership, individual differences, and work-related attitudes: A cross cultural investigation",

cultural determinants of leadership identified by the GLOBE researchers on to the following four "leadership dimensions" from the mid-range leadership theory proposed by Muczyk and Reimann based on observations of leadership behavior in North America:

- Consideration: Concern for people; good human relations; and treating subordinates with dignity, courtesy and respect.
- Concern for production: Emphasis on challenging goals; achievement orientation; and high standards.
- Incentive for performance: Creating the strongest performance reward connection that is permitted within the applicable organizational constraints.
- Democracy-autocracy: Degree to which subordinates are involved in making significant day-to-day, work related decisions, including goal setting.

Other scholars, such as Muczyk and Adler, had previously argued that in order to be "effective" leaders needed to score well on the first three dimensions (i.e., consideration, concern for production and incentive for performance), regardless of the situational context and that the "prescription for these dimensions is a normative one".[72] They claimed that research confirmed that those firms that were "well-run" placed a premium on "sound human relations, high performance expectations and rewards tied to accomplishment". However, Muczyk and Holt argued that even among these "universals" differences could be found based on the cultural profile of the society within which the leader was acting.[73] For example, the level of consideration displayed by leaders could be expected to be higher in societies that scored high on femininity and humane orientation and low on assertiveness. Muczyk and Hold also recommended that appropriate "consideration" by leaders in high in-group collectivist societies would include involving family members of subordinates in employer-sponsored social gatherings.[74] With respect to "concern for production", leaders are likely to place a greater priority on this dimension when uncertainty avoidance is high and the society has an external environmental orientation and a short-term time orientation. Finally, Muczyk and Holt believed that reward systems strongly linked to individual performance would be effective in highly individualistic and performance oriented societies while reward systems based on group- or organization-wide performance would be the preferred approach in societies that score high on collectivism and low on performance orientation.[75]

§3:2 Charismatic/value-based leadership

Applied Psychology: An International Review, 56 (2007), 212-230; and N. Nadler, International dimensions of organizational behavior (4th ed.) (Cincinnati, OH: Southwestern, 2002).

[72] Id. at 278 (citing J. Muczyk and T. Adler, "An attempt at a consentience regarding formal leadership", Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 9(2) (2002), 2-17).

[73] Id. at 282-283.

[74] Id. (citing M. Javidan and R. House, "Cultural acumen for the global manager: Lessons from Project GLOBE", Organizational Dynamics, 29 (2001), 289-305).

[75] With regard to evidence that organizations in different societal cultures use different reward systems, see R. Fischer, P. Smith, B. Richey, M. Ferreira, E. Assmar, J. Maes, et al., "How do organizations allocate rewards?", Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 38 (2007), 3-18.

The charismatic/value-based leadership theory dimension was of great interest to the GLOBE researchers given that it included a number of attributes that were universally praised as requirements for effective and outstanding leadership. This dimension reflects the ability to inspire, to motivate, and to expect high performance outcomes from others on the basis of firmly held core values.[76] The term "charisma" was defined as the power to inspire devotion and commitment for the group's goals and to produce power through infectious qualities of leadership and influence, involving a leader's aura, dynamism, and persuasiveness.[77] As noted above, the charismatic/value-based leadership dimension is statistically related to the largest number of primary leadership dimensions including extremely strong relationships to the charismatic/inspirational and charismatic/visionary dimensions along with the ties to charismatic/self-sacrifice, integrity, decisive and performance oriented. It has also been noted that a charismatic/value-based leader stresses high standards and innovation and strives to create a passion among his or her followers to perform and pursue a vision articulated by the leader.[78] It should not be forgotten, however, that while several attributes of charismatic/value-based leadership are universally endorsed as conditions for outstanding leadership the endorsement of many other attributes varied significantly along cultural lines and this means that charismatic or transformational leadership methods should be applied with cultural sensitivity by leaders and managers around the world.[79]

The range of the lowest to highest societal average score for this dimension on the 1-to-7 measurement scale was 4.5 to 6.5, which confirms that all of the societal cultures in the survey group believed that the charismatic/value-based leadership style contributed to outstanding leadership.[80] The societal clusters could be divided into three groups based on their relative enthusiasm for the charismatic/value-based leadership style. The group with the strongest preference for this style included the Anglo, Germanic Europe, Nordic Europe, Southern Asian, Latin Europe and Latin America clusters; the middle group included the Confucian Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa and Eastern Europe clusters; and the cluster with the lowest enthusiasm for the style was the Middle East (Arab) cluster.[81] The highest level of enthusiasm came from the Anglo cluster while the Middle East cluster had the lowest level of association between this dimension and outstanding leadership yet

---

[76] R. House, P. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. Dorfman and V. Gupta (Eds), Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies (Thousand Oaks CA: Sage, 2004), at 61 and 65.

[77] Id. at 500 and 515.

[78] M. Hoppe, "Culture and Leader Effectiveness: The GLOBE Study", September 2007, http://www.inspireimagineinnovate.com/PDF/GLOBEsummary-by-Michael-H-Hoppe.pdf   [accessed September 15, 2010]

[79] See generally D. Den Hartog, R. House, P. Hanges, S. Ruiz-Quintanilla, P. Dorfman and Globe Associates, "Culture specific and cross-culturally generalizable implicit leadership theories: Are attributes of charismatic/transformational leadership universally endorsed?" Leadership Quarterly (Special issue: Charismatic and Transformational Leadership: Taking Stock of the Present and Future (Part I), 10(2) (1999), 219-256.

[80] R. House, P. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. Dorfman and V. Gupta (Eds), Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies (Thousand Oaks CA: Sage, 2004), Table 21.1 at 676.

[81] R. House, P. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. Dorfman and V. Gupta (Eds), Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies (Thousand Oaks CA: Sage, 2004). Note that while clusters that are grouped together differ from clusters in other groups for the style there are no statistically significant differences between the clusters in a group.

with a mean score within the cluster of 5.35 that was well above the mid-point of 4 on the 1-to-7 measurement scale.

The GLOBE researchers found a strong and positive correlation between high performance orientation and charismatic/value-based leadership and, in fact, this style is often referred to as "performance-oriented." The researchers commented: "[a] major finding was the large influence of the Performance Orientation cultural dimension as the most important predictor of the Charismatic/Value-Based leadership dimension. Societies and organizations that value excellence, superior performance, performance improvement, and innovation will likely seek leaders who exemplify Charismatic/Value-Based qualities, and such leaders are likely to be effective."[82] High performance orientation societies have characteristics such as valuing training and development; valuing competitiveness and materialism; viewing formal feedback as necessary for performance improvement; valuing what one does more than who one is; and expecting direct and explicit communication.[83] The researchers advised that leaders can contribute to instilling a high value on performance orientation by setting ambitious goals, communicating high expectations for their subordinates, building their subordinates' self-confidence and intellectually challenging their subordinates.[84] In addition, the researchers noted that members of high performance oriented societies "seem to look to charismatic leaders who paint a picture of an ambitious and enticing future, but leave it to the people to build it".[85]

Charismatic/value-based leadership was also supported and endorsed among high in-group collectivist societies. In high in-group collectivist societies duties and obligations are important determinants of social behavior; a strong distinction is made between in-groups and out-groups; people emphasize relatedness with groups; the pace of life is slower; and love is assigned little weight in marriage.[86] In addition, charismatic/value-based leadership was supported and endorsed among high gender egalitarian societies. In high gender egalitarian societies there is an effort to minimize gender role differences and one finds more women in positions of authority, less occupational sex segregation, similar levels of educational attainment for males and females and women being afforded greater decision-making roles in community affairs.[87] Specific leadership attributes perceived as effective in high gender egalitarian societies included foresight, enthusiasm, self-sacrifice, egalitarianism, delegation and collective orientation.[88]

---

[82] Id. at 711.
[83] Id. at 245.
[84] Id. at 277.
[85] Id. at 278.
[86] Id. at 454.
[87] Id. at 359.
[88] Description of findings derived from M. Dickson, D. Den Hartog and J. Mitchelson, "Research on Leadership in a Cross-Cultural Context: Making Progress, and Raising New Questions", Leadership Quarterly, 14(6) (2003), 729-769, 746.

Charismatic leadership has sometimes been associated with a tendency and willingness of the leader to engage in "unconventional behavior" to motivate his or her followers.[89] It has been suggested, for example, that if leaders are willing and able to introduce "change" by adopting behaviors and attributes that are slightly different than what is traditionally expected and accepted under the dominant cultural values of the society they will be able to encourage innovation and improvements in performance among their followers provided that the disruption is not too radical.[90] While this concept sounds interesting and exciting and has some intuitive appeal there has been little evidence of support for the proposition in research studies that have been conducted to date.[91]

While the term "charismatic/value-based leadership" was chosen by the GLOBE researchers for inclusion in their list of culturally endorsed leadership theory dimensions, they noted that it was similar to transformational leadership, which has attracted great interest in the research community, and, in fact, one study focused on a leadership dimension explicitly referred to as "charismatic/transformational leadership" and noted that the results of the GLOBE survey provided evidence for the proposition that several attributes of charismatic/transformational leadership are universally endorsed as conditions for outstanding leadership while at the same time the endorsement of many other attributes varied significantly along cultural lines.[92]

Bass has been a strong advocate of the position that the transactional-transformational leadership paradigm is universal and "transcends organizational and national boundaries" and has supported his arguments with results from research conducted on a wide array of organizations around the world in several different sectors including business, education, the military, the government and the independent sector.[93] For example, Bass cited research supporting the effectiveness of transformational leadership in India, Japan, New Zealand and Singapore as evidence that the transactional-transformational leadership paradigm transcended organizational and national boundaries.[94] Others took issue with Bass on the basis that his argument regarding the cross-cultural popularity of transformational versus transactional leadership were based primarily on one country

---

[89] See, e.g., J. Conger and R. Kanungo, "Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings," Academy of Management Review, 12 (1987), 637-647.

[90] R. House, P. Hanges and S. Ruiz-Quintanilla, "GLOBE: The global leadership and organizational behavior effectiveness research program," Polish Psychological Bulletin, 28(3) (1997), 215-254.

[91] M. Dickson, D. Den Hartog and J. Mitchelson, "Research on Leadership in a Cross-Cultural Context: Making Progress, and Raising New Questions", Leadership Quarterly, 14(6) (2003), 729-769, 746.

[92] See generally D. Den Hartog, R. House, P. Hanges, S. Ruiz-Quintanilla, P. Dorfman and Globe Associates, "Culture specific and cross-culturally generalizable implicit leadership theories: Are attributes of charismatic/transformational leadership universally endorsed?" Leadership Quarterly (Special issue: Charismatic and Transformational Leadership: Taking Stock of the Present and Future (Part I), 10(2) (1999), 219-256.

[93] A. Ardichvili and K. Kuchinke, "Leadership styles and cultural values among managers and subordinates: a comparative study of four countries of the former Soviet Union, Germany and the US," Human Resource Development International, 5(1) (2002): 99-117, 102 (citing B. Bass, "Does the transactional-transformational paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries?", American Psychologist, 52 (1997), 130-139).

[94] See B. Bass, "Does the transactional-transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries?" American Psychologist, 52 (1997), 130-139.

studies carried out in a single cultural context. Another study of the impact of transformational leadership on teachers' commitment to change found similarities in North America and Hong Kong; however, the magnitude of the impact was much less among teachers in Hong Kong.[95] This finding is consistent with the work of other researchers who have examined the idea that while behaviors embodying transformational leadership are meaningful in all cultural contexts their enactment is demonstrably different depending on whether the context is Eastern or Western.[96] In addition, researchers compared managers and employees working in the US and Germany for the same telecommunications company to identify cultural differences with respect to the use and appreciation of transformational and transactional leadership styles and found that while US employees had higher levels of charisma and inspirational motivation than their German colleagues there were no other significant differences between the two cultural groups on any other transformational or transactional measures. The study also provided evidence that charisma and inspirational motivation could be predicted by the Hofstede's cultural dimensions of masculinity, individualism and long-term orientation.[97] Finally, in their study of four former countries of the Soviet Union (Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Russia) Ardichvili and Kuchinke found that the two leadership behaviors with the highest scores in those countries—"inspirational motivation" and "contingent reward"—came from both the transformational and transactional leadership styles, an indication that elements of both styles were being used in those countries concurrently.[98]

§3:3 Participative leadership

The GLOBE researchers explained that the participative leadership theory dimension reflected the degree to which managers involve others in making and implementing decisions. As noted above, this dimension is statistically related to two primary leadership dimensions (both reverse scored): autocratic and non-participative. It has also been noted that the participative leadership style emphasizes delegation and equality.[99] The range of the lowest to highest societal average score for this dimension on the 1-to-7

---

[95] H. Yu, K. Leithwood and D. Jantzi, "The effects of transformational leadership on teachers' commitment to change in Hong Kong," Journal of Educational Administration, 40(4/5) (2002): 368-390.

[96] See G. Spreitzer, K. Perttula and K. Xin, "Traditionality Matters: An Examination of the Effectiveness of Transformational Leadership in the U.S. and Taiwan", http://webuser.bus.umich.edu/spreitze/traditionalitymatters.pdf [accessed July 21, 2010]. See also D. Jung, B. Bass and J. Sosik. Bridging leadership and culture: A theoretical consideration of transformational leadership and collectivist cultures. The Journal of Leadership Studies, 2 (1995), 3-18 (suggesting that transformational leadership is generalizable but that it is more important in societies that can be categorized as "collectivist" since followers in those societies are more comfortable with the recommended focus of transformational leaders on collective mission, goals and responsibilities).

[97] K. Kuchinke, "Leadership and Culture: Work-related values and leadership styles among one company's U.S. and German telecommunication employees," Human Resource Development Quarterly, 1999:10(2), 135-154.

[98] A. Ardichvili and K. Kuchinke, "Leadership styles and cultural values among managers and subordinates: a comparative study of four countries of the former Soviet Union, Germany and the US," Human Resource Development International, 5(1) (2002): 99-117, 113

[99] M. Hoppe, "Culture and Leader Effectiveness: The GLOBE Study", September 2007, http://www.inspireimagineinnovate.com/PDF/GLOBEsummary-by-Michael-H-Hoppe.pdf [accessed September 15, 2010]

measurement scale was 4.5 to 6.1, which confirms that all of the societal cultures in the survey group believed that the participative leadership style contributed to outstanding leadership.[100] The societal clusters could be divided into three groups based on their relative enthusiasm for the participative leadership style. The group with the strongest preference for this style included the Germanic Europe, Anglo and Nordic Europe clusters; the middle group included the Latin Europe, Latin America and Sub-Saharan Africa clusters; and the group with the lowest enthusiasm for the style included the Eastern Europe, Southern Asian, Confucian Asia and Middle East (Arab) clusters.[101] The highest level of enthusiasm came from the Germanic Europe cluster (5.86) while the Middle East cluster had the lowest level of association between this dimension and outstanding leadership yet with a mean score within the cluster of 4.97 that was well above the mid-point of 4 on the 1-to-7 measurement scale.

The participative leadership style was supported and endorsed among high gender egalitarian societies.[102] In high gender egalitarian societies there is an effort to minimize gender role differences and one finds more women in positions of authority, less occupational sex segregation, similar levels of educational attainment for males and females and women being afforded greater decision-making roles in community affairs.[103] Specific leadership attributes perceived as effective in high gender egalitarian societies included foresight, enthusiasm, self-sacrifice, egalitarianism, delegation and collective orientation.[104] In addition, support for the participative leadership style was positively correlated to performance orientation.[105]

On the other hand, the participative leadership style was strongly disapproved of among high uncertainty societies.[106] Characteristics of high uncertainty avoidance societies (i.e., societies that attempt to reduce stressful ambiguity through creation and enforcement of norms, rules and procedures) include use of formality in interactions with others; maintenance of orderly and meticulous records; reliance on formalized policies and procedures; strong resistance to change and preference for moderate and carefully calculated risks.[107] It should also be noted that the intensity of endorsement of the

---

[100] R. House, P. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. Dorfman and V. Gupta (Eds), Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies (Thousand Oaks CA: Sage, 2004), Table 21.1 at 676.

[101] R. House, P. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. Dorfman and V. Gupta (Eds), Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies (Thousand Oaks CA: Sage, 2004). Note that while clusters that are grouped together differ from clusters in other groups for the style there are no statistically significant differences between the clusters in a group.

[102] P. Dorfman, P. Hanges and F. Brodbeck, "Leadership prototypes and cultural variation: The identification of culturally endorsed implicit theories of leadership," in R. House et al. (2004), supra note _.

[103] Id. at 359.

[104] Description of findings derived from M. Dickson, D. Den Hartog and J. Mitchelson, "Research on Leadership in a Cross-Cultural Context: Making Progress, and Raising New Questions", Leadership Quarterly, 14(6) (2003), 729-769, 746.

[105] P. Dorfman, P. Hanges and F. Brodbeck, "Leadership prototypes and cultural variation: The identification of culturally endorsed implicit theories of leadership," in R. House, P. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. Dorfman and V. Gupta (Eds), Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies (Thousand Oaks CA: Sage, 2004).

[106] Id.

[107] Id. at 618.

participative leadership style within a country was negatively correlated with the strength of assertiveness in that country.[108]

The GLOBE researchers reported finding some statistical evidence of a negative correlation between the participative leadership style and high power distance[109], which would seem to be logically expected given that high power distance societies are characterized by class differentiation and hording of resources and information by the limited few vested with power and status; however, the correlation was not sufficiently strong for the researchers to cite is as one of their major finding with respect to the relationships between the cultural and leadership style dimensions. The participative leadership style was endorsed in GLOBE country clusters where small power distance was the norm—Anglo, Germanic and Nordic European—while it was not embraced as strongly in country clusters where large power distances were more prevalent such as the Confucian Asian, East European, Middle Eastern and Southern Asian clusters.[110] Other studies of smaller groups of countries have also provided support for the notion that participative leadership is only effective in the countries with smaller power distance and not particularly effective in the other larger power distance countries.[111]

Another study provided support for the relationship between cultural values and the preferred level of subordinate involvement (i.e., "participation") in decisions that managers are required to make regarding strategy and operations. Specifically, managers were more likely to tap into the experience of subordinates and allow them to participate in decisions when the societal cultural values included high individualism, cultural autonomy, egalitarianism, low power distance, harmony and femininity; however, supervisorial authority and formal rules played much bigger roles in the making of decisions—and subordinate participation was minimal or non-existent—in societies characterized by collectivism, cultural embeddedness, hierarchy, power distance, mastery and masculinity.[112]

One study using the GLOBE data to explore attitudes regarding various leadership attributes in Europe found that participative leadership was endorsed as strongly contributing to effective leadership in France and in countries in the North/West European region; however, countries in the South/East European region were lukewarm on that style.[113] Several other studies using relatively small groups of countries, three to

---

[108] Id.

[109] Id.

[110] Id.

[111] See P. Dorfman, J. Howell, S. Hibino, J. Lee, U. Tate and A. Bautista, "Leadership in Western and Asian countries: Commonalities and differences in effective leadership processes across cultures", The Leadership Quarterly, 8(3) (1997), 233–274; and N. Bu, T. Craig and T. Peng, "Acceptance of supervisory direction in typical workplace situations: A comparison of US, Taiwanese and PRC employees", International Journal of Cross Cultural Management, 1(2) (2001), 131-152.

[112] P. Smith, M. Peterson, S. Schwartz, A. Ahmad, D. Akande, J. Andersen et al., "Cultural values, sources of guidance, and their relevance to managerial behavior—A 47-nation study," Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 33(2) (2002), 188-208.

[113] F. Broadbeck, M. Frese, S. Akerblom, G. Audia, G. Bakacsi, H. Bendova, et al., "Cultural variation of leadership prototypes across 22 European countries," Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 73(1) (2000), 1-29.

five, from different parts of the world identified universal support within those groups for leadership attributes such as leadership supportiveness, contingent reward, charisma, participative leadership, supportive leadership, directive leadership, low neuroticism and high extroversion.[114]

A participatory leadership style is related to the democracy-autocracy dimension in the "global framework of leadership" model suggested by Muczyk and Holt. Muczyk and Adler believed that democracy-autocracy was "situational" and required great attention to alignment with a large range of societal culture dimensions, including power distance, individualism-collectivism, masculinity-femininity, uncertainty avoidance, perceived role hierarchy, environmental orientation and the acceptability of bypassing the chain of command (i.e., rigidity of hierarchy).[115] Muczyk and Holt observed that "democratic leadership" with respect to making decisions and setting goals "may be suited for cultures that are low on power distance, high on individualism and femininity, low on uncertainty avoidance and characterized by internal environmental orientation" and "might also be suitable in societies whose members have a low regard for hierarchy and an inclination to bypass the chain of command".[116] On the other hand, Muczyk and Holt speculated that "autocratic leadership" might be more appropriate in societies "that are high in power distance, collectivism, masculinity, and uncertainty avoidance and that are characterized by external environmental orientation" and in societies "whose members have a high regard for hierarchy and are reluctant to bypass the chain of command".[117] The observations made by Muczyk and Holt were similar to those made by Hofstede, who argued that large power distance and collectivism were closely related and typically associated with developing countries while small power distance and high individualism were closely related and typically associated with industrialized countries.[118]

§3:4 Autonomous leadership

---

[114] See P. Dorfman, J. Howell, S. Hibino, J. Lee, U. Tate and A. Bautista, "Leadership in Western and Asian countries: Commonalities and differences in effective leadership processes across cultures", The Leadership Quarterly, 8(3) (1997), 233–274 (endorsement of leadership supportiveness, contingent reward and charisma in Japan, Korea, Mexico, Taiwan and the US); R. Mehta, T. Larsen, B. Rosenbloom, J. Mazur and P. Polsa, "Leadership and cooperation in marketing channels: A comparative empirical analysis of the USA, Finland and Poland," International Marketing Review, 18(6) (2001), 633-667 (endorsement of participative, supportive and directive leadership); and C. Silverthorne, "Leadership effectiveness and personality: A cross-cultural evaluation," Personality and Individual Differences, 30(2) (2001), 303-309 (endorsement of low neuroticism and high extroversion in China, Thailand and the US).

[115] J. Muczyk and T. Adler, "An attempt at a consentience regarding formal leadership", Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 9(2) (2002), 2-17. Muczyk and Adler actually distinguished between the style used for making decisions and setting goals, the democracy-autocracy continuum, and the amount of follow-up or directive behavior associated with execution of a decision that has been made or attainment of a goal that has been established, the directive-participative continuum. As a result, rather than leaders being "democratic" or "autocratic", Muczyk and Adler identified four "leadership types" by combining the extremes of the two continuums: directive autocrat, permissive autocrat, directive democrat and permissive democrat.

[116] J. Muczyk and D. Holt, "Toward a Cultural Contingency Model of Leadership", Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 14(4) (May 2008), 277-286, 282.

[117] Id.

[118] G. Hofstede, "The cultural relativity of organizational practices and theories", Journal of International Business Studies, Fall 1983, 82.

The GLOBE researchers described the autonomous leadership style dimension as referring to independent, individualistic and self-centric leadership.[119] As noted above, this dimension was statistically related to one of the primary leadership dimensions which itself was named "autonomous". The range of the lowest to highest societal average score for this dimension on the 1-to-7 measurement scale was 2.3 to 4.7, which means that most societies were either neutral about the impact of autonomous leadership behaviors on the effectiveness of the leader or felt that such behaviors had a moderately inhibiting impact on leader effectiveness.[120] While it was possible for several leadership styles to divide the societal clusters into groups based on statistically based differences in their relative enthusiasm for the style this was not possible for the autonomous leadership style as there were no statistically significant differences across all the clusters. The highest level of enthusiasm for the autonomous leadership style came from the Eastern Europe and Germanic Europe clusters, each of which had mean scores within the cluster that were slightly above the mid-point of 4 on the 1-to-7 measurement scale (i.e., Eastern Europe (4.20) and Germanic Europe (4.16)), while the strongest sentiment against autonomous leadership as a contributor to effective leadership was found in the Sub-Sahara African, Middle Eastern, Latin European and Latin American country clusters.[121]

Autonomous leadership was found to be strongly and positively correlated with high performance orientation; however, high institutional collectivist societies, which value group loyalty and expect group participation in the making of decisions, strongly disapproved of autonomous leadership style. Brodbeck et al. found that a leadership dimension that they also referred to as "autonomy" was perceived to be more prototypical of outstanding leadership in those European countries where autonomy was strong (i.e., the Germanic cluster, Georgia and the Czech Republic) than in those countries where autonomy was weaker (i.e., the Anglo, Nordic, Central, Latin and Near East European country clusters).[122]

§3:5   Team oriented leadership

---

[119] M. Hoppe, "Culture and Leader Effectiveness: The GLOBE Study", September 2007, http://www.inspireimagineinnovate.com/PDF/GLOBEsummary-by-Michael-H-Hoppe.pdf   [accessed September 15, 2010]

[120] R. House, P. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. Dorfman and V. Gupta (Eds), Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies (Thousand Oaks CA: Sage, 2004), Table 21.1 at 676.

[121] P. Dorfman, P. Hanges and F. Brodbeck, "Leadership prototypes and cultural variation: The identification of culturally endorsed implicit theories of leadership," in R. House, P. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. Dorfman and V. Gupta (Eds), Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies (Thousand Oaks CA: Sage, 2004). The Latin America cluster had the lowest level of association between the autonomous leadership style and outstanding leadership yet with a mean score within the cluster below the mid-point of the measurement scale at 3.51.

[122] F. Brodbeck, M. Frese, S. Akerblom, G. Audia, G. Bakacsi, H. Bendova, et al., "Cultural variation of leadership prototypes across 22 European countries," Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 73(1) (2000), 1-29. It should be noted that Brodbeck et al. developed and tested leadership prototypes that differed from those used by the GLOBE researchers—Interpersonal Directness and Proximity, Autonomy and Modesty.

The GLOBE researchers described the team oriented leadership style dimension as emphasizing effective team building and implementation of a common purpose or goal among team members. As noted above, this dimension is statistically related to five primary leadership dimensions including collaborative team orientation, team integrator, diplomatic, administratively competent and a reverse scored malevolent. Team oriented leaders are skilled in instilling and maintaining pride, loyalty and collaboration among their followers.[123] The range of the lowest to highest societal average score for this dimension on the 1-to-7 measurement scale was 4.7 to 6.2, which confirms that all of the societal cultures in the survey group believed that the team oriented leadership style contributed to outstanding leadership.[124] While it was possible for several leadership styles to divide the societal clusters into groups based on statistically based differences in their relative enthusiasm for the style this was not possible for the team oriented leadership style as there were no statistically significant differences across all the clusters.[125] The highest level of enthusiasm for the team oriented leadership style came from the Latin America cluster while the Middle East cluster had the lowest level of association between this style and outstanding leadership yet the mean score within the cluster of 5.47 was well above the mid-point of 4 on the 1-to-7 measurement scale.

The GLOBE researchers were mildly surprised to find that the team oriented leadership style was supported and endorsed among high uncertainty avoidance societies.[126] Characteristics of high uncertainty avoidance societies (i.e., societies that attempt to reduce stressful ambiguity through creation and enforcement of norms, rules and procedures) include use of formality in interactions with others; maintenance of orderly and meticulous records; reliance on formalized policies and procedures; strong resistance to change and preference for moderate and carefully calculated risks.[127] The team oriented leadership style was also supported and endorsed among high in-group collectivist societies. In high in-group collectivist societies duties and obligations are important determinants of social behavior; a strong distinction is made between in-groups and out-groups; people emphasize relatedness with groups; the pace of life is slower; and love is assigned little weight in marriage. Finally, team-oriented leadership was perceived as being especially important for effective leadership in high uncertainty avoidance societies.[128]

§3:6 Humane oriented leadership

---

[123] M. Hoppe, "Culture and Leader Effectiveness: The GLOBE Study", September 2007, http://www.inspireimagineinnovate.com/PDF/GLOBEsummary-by-Michael-H-Hoppe.pdf [accessed September 15, 2010]

[124] R. House, P. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. Dorfman and V. Gupta (Eds), Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies (Thousand Oaks CA: Sage, 2004), Table 21.1 at 676.

[125] Id.

[126] Id at 712.

[127] Id. at 618.

[128] P. Dorfman, P. Hanges and F. Brodbeck, "Leadership prototypes and cultural variation: The identification of culturally endorsed implicit theories of leadership," in R. House, P. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. Dorfman and V. Gupta (Eds), Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies (Thousand Oaks CA: Sage, 2004). The strongest endorsement of team-oriented leadership was found in those clusters—Southern Asian, Confucian Asian and Latin American—where the scores of members on in-group collectivism, humane orientation and uncertainty avoidance were all high.

The GLOBE researchers described the humane oriented leadership style dimension as reflecting patient, supportive and considerate leadership as well as compassion, generosity and concern for the well-being of others.[129] As noted above, this dimension is statistically related to two primary leadership dimensions—modesty and humane oriented. Across all of the societal cultures this dimension was generally viewed positively as reflected by the fact that the range of the lowest to highest societal average score for this dimension on the 1-to-7 measurement scale was 3.8 to 5.6; however, the level of enthusiasm for humane oriented leadership was not as high as it was for other leadership styles such as charismatic/value-based, team oriented and participative.[130] The societal clusters could be divided into three groups based on their relative enthusiasm for the humane orientation leadership style. The group with the strongest preference for this style included the Southern Asian, Anglo, Sub-Saharan Africa and Confucian Asia clusters; the middle group included the Germanic Europe, Middle East (Arab), Latin America and Eastern Europe clusters; and the group with the lowest enthusiasm for the style included the Latin Europe and Nordic Europe clusters.[131] The highest level of support for the humane oriented leadership style came from the Southern Asia cluster (5.38) while the Nordic Europe cluster had the lowest level of association between this style and outstanding leadership (4.42, just slightly above the mid -point of 4 on the 1-to-7 measurement scale).

The humane orientation leadership style was, not surprisingly, supported and endorsed by high human orientation societies. In high humane orientation societies one finds the interests of others are important, people are motivated primarily by a need for belonging and affiliation, members of society feel that they are responsible for promoting the well-being of others, child labor is limited by public sanctions and people are urged to be sensitive to all forms of racial discrimination.[132] The humane oriented leadership style was also supported and endorsed among high uncertainty avoidance societies. Characteristics of high uncertainty avoidance societies (i.e., societies that attempt to reduce stressful ambiguity through creation and enforcement of norms, rules and procedures) include use of formality in interactions with others; maintenance of orderly and meticulous records; reliance on formalized policies and procedures; strong resistance to change and preference for moderate and carefully calculated risks.[133]

§3:7   Self protective leadership

---

[129] M. Hoppe, "Culture and Leader Effectiveness: The GLOBE Study", September 2007, http://www.inspireimagineinnovate.com/PDF/GLOBEsummary-by-Michael-H-Hoppe.pdf [accessed September 15, 2010]

[130] R. House, P. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. Dorfman and V. Gupta (Eds), Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies (Thousand Oaks CA: Sage, 2004), Table 21.1 at 676.

[131] R. House, P. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. Dorfman and V. Gupta (Eds), Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies (Thousand Oaks CA: Sage, 2004), Note that while clusters that are grouped together differ from clusters in other groups for the style there are no statistically significant differences between the clusters in a group.

[132] Id. at 570.

[133] Id. at 618.

The GLOBE researchers explained that the self protective leadership style dimension focused on ensuring the safety and security of the individual or group member and was composed of items that reflected being status- and class-conscious, ritualistic, procedural, normative, secretive, evasive, indirect, self-centered, and asocial. The researchers commented, for example, that self-protective leaders may need to "protect themselves from acts of criticism and corruption," may want to insure "that they are not made into scapegoats for political ends," and may wish to "respond to humane considerations".[134] As noted above, this dimension is statistically related to several of the aforementioned primary leadership dimensions including self-centered, status conscious, conflict-inducer, face-saver and procedural.

Across all of the societal cultures this dimension was generally viewed neutrally as reflected by the fact that the range of the lowest to highest societal average score for this dimension on the 1-to-7 measurement scale was 2.5 to 4.6.[135] The societal clusters could be divided into three groups based on their relative enthusiasm for the self-protective leadership style. The group with the strongest preference for this style included the Middle East (Arab), Confucian Asia, Southern Asian, Latin America and Eastern Europe clusters; the middle group included the Sub-Saharan Africa and Latin Europe clusters; and the group with the lowest enthusiasm for the style included the Anglo, Germanic Europe and Nordic Europe clusters.[136] The highest level of support for self protective leadership came from the Southern Asia cluster (3.83, just slightly below the mid-point of 4 on the 1-to-7 measurement scale) while the Nordic Europe cluster had the lowest level of association between this style and outstanding leadership at 2.72, a sign that societies in this cluster felt that self-protective behaviors inhibited effective leadership.

The self protective leadership style was supported and endorsed among high uncertainty avoidance societies. Characteristics of high uncertainty avoidance societies (i.e., societies that attempt to reduce stressful ambiguity through creation and enforcement of norms, rules and procedures) include use of formality in interactions with others; maintenance of orderly and meticulous records; reliance on formalized policies and

---

[134] R. House, P. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. Dorfman and V. Gupta (Eds), Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies (Thousand Oaks CA: Sage, 2004), at 555.

[135] Id., Table 21.1 at 676.

[136] R. House, P. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. Dorfman and V. Gupta (Eds), Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies (Thousand Oaks CA: Sage, 2004). Note that while clusters that are grouped together differ from clusters in other groups for the style there are no statistically significant differences between the clusters in a group. A study using the entire GLOBE dataset found that self-protective leadership was generally viewed as neutral or negative; however, there were significant cultural variations. In the Nordic Europe clusters, as well as in the Germanic Europe cluster, attributes of self-protective leadership such as self-centered, status conscious, face saving and inducing conflict were perceived as extremely inhibiting effective leadership; however, the reaction to those attributes in countries in the Asian cultural clusters was much less hostile. See P. Dorfman, P. Hanges and F. Brodbeck, "Leadership prototypes and cultural variation: The identification of culturally endorsed implicit theories of leadership," in R. House, P. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. Dorfman and V. Gupta (Eds), Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies (Thousand Oaks CA: Sage, 2004).

procedures; strong resistance to change and preference for moderate and carefully calculated risks.[137]

The self protective leadership style was also supported and endorsed among high power distance societies. Characteristics of high power distance societies include differentiation of the society into classes, power is perceived as providing social order, limited upward social mobility, resources are available only to a select few and information is localized and hoarded.[138] The researchers commented that "the high power distance values and practices of Asian societies are often associated with face-saving and status-consciousness, both of which are elements of the Self-Protective leadership dimension."[139]

Self protective leadership was explored in detail by Brodbeck et al. in their study of cultural variation of leadership prototypes in Europe.[140] While those researchers borrowed significantly from the GLOBE project they chose to design and analyze three of their own leadership dimensions: interpersonal directness and proximity, autonomy and modesty. The first dimension, interpersonal directness and proximity, was closely associated, albeit negatively, with several of the key attributes associated with self protective leadership. Specifically, the researchers explained that interpersonal directness and proximity ". . . was shown to be most distinctively and negatively associated with Face Saver, comprising leadership attributes such as indirect, evasive, avoids negatives and face saving; with Self Centered, comprising the attributes, self interested, non-participative, loner and asocial; and with Administrative, comprising orderly organized and good administrator." The researchers also noted that interpersonal directness and proximity ". . . was most distinctly and positively related with Inspirational, comprising for example enthusiastic, encouraging, confidence builder, morale booster and motive arouser; and with Integrity comprising for example, honest, sincere, just and trustworthy." In summary, label "directness" was the opposite of "face saving" (i.e., self protective in the language of the GLOBE leadership dimensions). Their analysis of the data from all of the European countries led them to conclude that in the Germanic, Anglo and Nordic countries (most prominently in Finland), leadership attributes of interpersonal directness and proximity are perceived to be more prototypical of outstanding leadership than in South/East European countries and, in fact, this dimension mainly separated the South/East from North/West European countries.[141] This finding was roughly consistent with the GLOBE project—self protective leadership was disapproved of in the Nordic Europe cluster yet endorsed among societies in the Eastern Europe cluster.[142]

---

[137] R. House, P. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. Dorfman and V. Gupta (Eds), Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies (Thousand Oaks CA: Sage, 2004), at 618.
[138] Id. at 536.
[139] Id. at 707.
[140] F. Brodbeck, M. Frese, S. Akerblom, G. Audia, G. Bakacsi, H. Bendova, et al., "Cultural variation of leadership prototypes across 22 European countries," Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 73(1) (2000), 1-29.
[141] Id.
[142] As noted above, the leadership profiles of the Eastern Europe and Nordic Europe clusters are strongly different from one another.

Another study dealt with conflict inducement, which is one of the primary leadership dimensions associated with self-protective leadership. Specifically, Morris et al. studied the impact that cultural background might have on the preferences of managers from four countries—China, India, the Philippines and the US—with respect to conflict resolution styles and techniques.[143] The survey and accompanying analysis led to the conclusion that US managers relied more heavily on a competing style of conflict resolution while Chinese managers were likely to choose and follow an avoiding conflict style. It has been suggested that this result can be linked to the finding that US managers have higher achievement values than their managerial colleagues in China and that Chinese managers place a higher value on social conservatism (i.e., conformity and adherence to tradition) than US managers.[144]

---

[143] M. Morris, K. Williams, K. Leung, R. Larrick, M. Mendoza, D. Bhatnager, et al., "Conflict management style: Accounting for cross-national differences," Journal of International Business Studies, 29(4) (1998), 729-747.

[144] China and the Philippines scored higher than India and the US with respect to social conservatism and US managers had higher achievement values than their managerial colleagues in China, India and the Philippines. The scores of the countries with respect to the weight and respect given to conformity and tradition correlated with the finding that the value of power was rated much more highly by managers in China, India and the Philippines than by managers in the US.

Chapter 4
Cultural Dimensions and Leadership Attributes

§4:1   Introduction

One of the most important byproducts of the Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness ("GLOBE") project was the identification and measurement of a set of cultural dimensions that could be used to facilitate analysis of the relationship between the cultural dimensions associated with a society and the preferences and dislikes of that society with respect to the attributes and behaviors of its leaders.[145] For each of the cultural dimensions in their model the GLOBE researchers confirmed statistically significant associations with any of the culturally endorsed leadership theory dimensions they had identified based on the results of their study.[146] The associations were made using cultural dimension values, not measurements of actual practice, because both cultural values and the leadership theory dimensions represent desired states with respect to culture and leadership attributes, respectively.[147] There were numerous such associations for each cultural dimension; however, the sections below generally cite only those associations that were classified as "highly significant" by the researchers and also describe the findings of a number of other researchers who have examined relationships between the broadly understood and accepted societal cultural dimensions and leadership styles, attributes and behaviors.[148]

§4:2   Uncertainty avoidance

Characteristics of high uncertainty avoidance societies (i.e., societies that attempt to reduce stressful ambiguity through creation and enforcement of norms, rules and procedures) include use of formality in interactions with others; maintenance of orderly and meticulous records; reliance on formalized policies and procedures; strong resistance to change and preference for moderate and carefully calculated risks.[149] The GLOBE researchers found that the attributes associated with team-oriented leadership were perceived as being especially important for effective leadership in societies where uncertainty avoidance, as well as in-group collectivism and humane orientation, were all high such as the countries in the Southern Asian, Confucian Asian and Latin American clusters, all of which strongly endorsed team-oriented leadership styles.[150] The GLOBE

---

[145] For detailed discussion of the cultural dimensions identified and assessed by the GLOBE researchers, see "Globalization: A Library of Resources for Sustainable Entrepreneurs" prepared and distributed by the Sustainable Entrepreneurship Project (www.seproject.org).

[146] For detailed discussion of the culturally endorsed leadership dimensions identified by the GLOBE researchers, see the chapter on "GLOBE Project Leadership Theory Dimensions" in "Cross-Cultural Leadership Studies" in "Leadership: A Library of Resources for Sustainable Entrepreneurs" prepared and distributed by the Sustainable Entrepreneurship Project (www.seproject.org).

[147] R. House, P. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. Dorfman and V. Gupta (Eds), Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies (Thousand Oaks CA: Sage, 2004), at 45.

[148] Id. at 702-708.

[149] Id. at 618.

[150] P. Dorfman, P. Hanges and F. Brodbeck, "Leadership prototypes and cultural variation: The identification of culturally endorsed implicit theories of leadership," in R. House et al. (2004), supra note _.

researchers also found that the general rule was that the intensity of endorsement of participative leadership within a country was negatively correlated with the strength of uncertainty avoidance, assertiveness and power distance in that country.[151] The humane oriented leadership style was also supported and endorsed among high uncertainty avoidance societies. Finally, the self protective leadership style was supported and endorsed among high uncertainty avoidance societies. High uncertainty avoidance societies are preoccupied with alleviating the unpredictability of future events and thus it is not surprising that this leadership style is popular in such societies since being self-protective is one means to reduce uncertainty.[152]

Several other researchers have studied the relationship between uncertainty avoidance and preferred leadership attributes and strategies. One study found that middle managers in different countries found variations in their opinions regarding the effectiveness of leadership attributes such as being habitual, procedural, risk-taking, able to anticipate, formal, cautious and orderly.[153] Another study conducted of the actual behavior of managers in different countries found that as uncertainty avoidance levels rose managers tended to become more controlling and directive, less delegating and less approachable.[154] This is consistent with research that found that managers in Germany, a high uncertainty avoidance country, expected their subordinates to be punctual and reliable while managers in Great Britain, a low uncertainty avoidance country, expected their subordinates to demonstrate resourcefulness and improvisation.[155]

Persons in high uncertainty avoidance societies were less open to "innovation champions" and "transformational leaders" and preferred that efforts to promote innovation were carried out through formal channel, rules and procedures and in accordance with existing organizational norms. In contrast, in societies where uncertainty avoidance was lower there was greater acceptance and endorsement of radical innovation championing activities that included, if necessary, violation of existing organizational rules and regulations.[156]

§4:3   Individualism/collectivism

The GLOBE researchers broke Hofstede's individualism/collectivism dimension into institutional collectivism, which measured societal emphasis on collectivism; and in-

---

[151] Id.

[152]   R. House, P. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. Dorfman and V. Gupta (Eds), Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies (Thousand Oaks CA: Sage, 2004), 707.

[153] D. Den Hartog, R. House, P. Hanges, S. Ruiz-Quintanilla, P. Dorfman and GLOBE Associates, "Culture specific and cross-culturally generalizable implicit leadership theories: Are attributes of charismatic/transformational leadership universally endorsed?" Leadership Quarterly (special Issue: Charismatic and Transformational Leadership: Taking Stock of the Present and Future (Part I)), 10(2) (1999), 219-256.

[154] L. Offermann and P. Hellmann, "Culture's consequences for leadership behavior: National values in action," Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 28(3) (1997), 342-351.

[155] R. Stewart, J. Barsoux, A. Kieser, H. Ganter and P. Walgenbach, Managing in Britain and Germany (London: St. Martin's Press/MacMillan Press, 1994).

[156] S. Shane, "Uncertainty avoidance and the preference for innovation championing roles," Journal of International Studies, 26 (1995), 47-68.

group collectivism, which measured group (family and/or organization) collectivism. In high in-group collectivist societies duties and obligations are important determinants of social behavior; a strong distinction is made between in-groups and out-groups; people emphasize relatedness with groups; the pace of life is slower; and love is assigned little weight in marriage.[157] The GLOBE researchers found that the attributes associated with team-oriented leadership were perceived as being especially important for effective leadership in societies where in-group collectivism, as well as uncertainty avoidance and humane orientation, were all high such as the countries in the Southern Asian, Confucian Asian and Latin American clusters, all of which strongly endorsed team-oriented leadership styles.[158] The enthusiasm for team oriented leadership among high in-group collectivist societies is not surprising given the value that such societies place on pride, loyalty, and cohesiveness in their organizations or families.[159] Charismatic/value-based leadership was also supported and endorsed among high in-group collectivist societies such as the countries in the Anglo, Germanic and Nordic culture clusters.[160] The GLOBE researchers found that high institutional collectivist societies, which value group loyalty and expect group participation in the making of decisions, strongly disapproved of autonomous leadership style.

It has been suggested that transformational leadership styles might be more successful in collectivist societies since persons in those societies are more willing to subordinate their own personal goals to the goals established for their organizations.[161] Jung et al. suggested that transformational leadership is generalizable but that it is more important in societies that can be categorized as "collectivist" since followers in those societies tend to identify with the goals of their leaders and the common purposes and objectives established for their group or organization would therefore be more comfortable with the recommended focus of transformational leaders on collective mission, goals and responsibilities.[162] As for leadership styles in individualistic societies where persons are more concerned about themselves and motivated by individual achievement and rewards it would appear that short-term focused transactional leadership would be a more appropriate and effective approach.[163] Another study compared managers and employees

---

[157] R. House, P. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. Dorfman and V. Gupta (Eds), Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies (Thousand Oaks CA: Sage, 2004), 454.

[158] P. Dorfman, P. Hanges and F. Brodbeck, "Leadership prototypes and cultural variation: The identification of culturally endorsed implicit theories of leadership," in R. House, P. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. Dorfman and V. Gupta (Eds), Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies (Thousand Oaks CA: Sage, 2004).

[159] Id. at 712.

[160] P. Dorfman, P. Hanges and F. Brodbeck, "Leadership prototypes and cultural variation: The identification of culturally endorsed implicit theories of leadership," in R. House, P. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. Dorfman and V. Gupta (Eds), Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies (Thousand Oaks CA: Sage, 2004).

[161] See, e.g., P. Earley, "Playing follow the leader: Status-determining traits in relation to collective efficacy across cultures," Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 80(3) (1999), 192-212; and H. Triandis, Individualism and collectivism (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1995).

[162] D. Jung,, B. Bass and J. Sosik. Bridging leadership and culture: A theoretical consideration of transformational leadership and collectivist cultures. The Journal of Leadership Studies, 2 (1995), 3-18.

[163] D. Jung and B. Avolio, "Effects of leadership style and followers' cultural orientation on performance in group and individual task conditions, "Academy of Management Journal, 42(2) (1999), 208-218

working in the US and Germany for the same telecommunications company to identify cultural differences with respect to the use and appreciation of transformational and transactional leadership styles and found that while US employees had higher levels of charisma and inspirational motivation than their German colleagues there were no other significant differences between the two cultural groups on any other transformational or transactional measures. The study also provided evidence that charisma and inspirational motivation could be predicted by the cultural dimensions of masculinity, individualism and long-term orientation.[164]

Several groups of researchers have used the horizontal/vertical distinctions within the individualism-collectivism continuum to examine topics related to leadership styles and practices.[165] For example, researchers studying and comparing the US and Denmark determined that the US was more vertically oriented than Denmark while Denmark was more horizontally oriented than the US and suggested that this could explain why Americans placed more emphasis on achievement, displays of success and setting and achieving goals than the Danes.[166] Another study focusing on authoritarianism— deference to and respect for authority—have found evidence of correlations between authoritarianism and vertical individualism and collectivism.[167] Triandis and Gelfand also found vertical collectivists to be more authoritarian and traditional, but also stressed sociability, while horizontal collectivists stressed sociability, interdependence and hedonism. As for individualists, they found that vertical individualists stressed competition and hedonism more than horizontal individualists and that self-reliance was a trait that horizontal individualists consistently found to be important.[168]

§4:4 Humane orientation

In high humane orientation societies one finds the interests of others are important, people are motivated primarily by a need for belonging and affiliation, members of society feel that they are responsible for promoting the well-being of others, child labor is limited by public sanctions and people are urged to be sensitive to all forms of racial

---

[164] K. Kuchinke, "Leadership and Culture: Work-related values and leadership styles among one company's U.S. and German telecommunication employees," Human Resource Development Quarterly, 1999:10(2), 135-154.

[165] See also M. Dickson, D. Den Hartog and J. Mitchelson, "Research on Leadership in a Cross-Cultural Context: Making Progress, and Raising New Questions", Leadership Quarterly, 14(6) (2003), 729-769, 744 (noting that further research on the horizontal and vertical aspects of individualism and collectivism would be useful since it is likely that different leadership traits will be required to effectively lead and manage persons in each of the four groups).

[166] M. Nelson and S. Shavitt, "Horizontal and vertical individualism and achievement values: A multimethod examination of Denmark and the United States," Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 33(5) (2002), 439-758.

[167] M. Kemmelmeier, E. Burnstein, K. Krumov, P. Genkova, C. Kanagawa, M. Hirshberg, et al., "Individualism, collectivism and authoritarianism in seven societies," Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 34(3) (2003), 304-322.

[168] H. Triandis and M. Gelfand, "Converging measurement of horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74(1) (1998), 118-128, 119.

discrimination.[169]   The humane orientation leadership style was, not surprisingly, supported and endorsed by high human orientation societies. The GLOBE researchers also found that the attributes associated with team-oriented leadership were perceived as being especially important for effective leadership in societies where humane orientation, as well as uncertainty avoidance and in-group collectivism, were all high such as the countries in the Southern Asian, Confucian Asian and Latin American clusters, all of which strongly endorsed team-oriented leadership styles.[170]   Finally, the level of support for charismatic/value-based leadership was likely to be higher in societies where cultural values included strong humane orientation and in-group collectivism such as the countries in the Anglo, Germanic and Nordic culture clusters.[171]

§4:5   Assertiveness

Conversational directedness is associated with assertiveness and is an important consideration in the communication techniques practiced by leaders. Leaders need to be mindful that attitudes differ among societies regarding the degree to which attributes such as "indirect", "evasive" and "intuitive" are considered to be important to outstanding leadership skills.[172]   For example, while directness is valued and indirectness is perceived as socially undesirable in the US societies such as Korea tend to be more indirect.[173]   The general rule was that the intensity of endorsement of participative leadership within a country was negatively correlated with the strength of assertiveness, uncertainty avoidance and power distance in that country.[174]

§4:6   Power distance

Characteristics of high power distance societies include differentiation of the society into classes, power is perceived as providing social order, limited upward social mobility,

---

[169]   R. House, P. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. Dorfman and V. Gupta (Eds), Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies (Thousand Oaks CA: Sage, 2004), 570.

[170] P. Dorfman, P. Hanges and F. Brodbeck, "Leadership prototypes and cultural variation: The identification of culturally endorsed implicit theories of leadership," in R. House, P. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. Dorfman and V. Gupta (Eds), Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies (Thousand Oaks CA: Sage, 2004).

[171] Id.

[172] D. Den Hartog, R. House, P. Hanges, S. Ruiz-Quintanilla, P. Dorfman and Globe Associates, "Culture specific and cross-culturally generalizable implicit leadership theories: Are attributes of charismatic/transformational leadership universally endorsed?" Leadership Quarterly (Special issue: Charismatic and Transformational Leadership: Taking Stock of the Present and Future (Part I), 10(2) (1999), 219-256.

[173] T. Holtgraves, "Styles of language use: Individual and cultural variability in conversational indirectness," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73 (1997), 624-637. It has been suggested that indirectness in communication can be linked to "face management". See P. Brown and S. Levinson, Politeness: some universals in language usage (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1987).

[174] P. Dorfman, P. Hanges and F. Brodbeck, "Leadership prototypes and cultural variation: The identification of culturally endorsed implicit theories of leadership," in R. House, P. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. Dorfman and V. Gupta (Eds), Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies (Thousand Oaks CA: Sage, 2004).

resources are available only to a select few and information is localized and hoarded.[175] The general rule was that the intensity of endorsement of participative leadership within a country was negatively correlated with the strength of power distance.[176] The participative leadership style was endorsed in GLOBE country clusters where small power distance was the norm—Anglo, Germanic and Nordic European—while it was not embraced as strongly in country clusters where large power distances were more prevalent such as the Confucian Asian, East European, Middle Eastern and Southern Asian clusters.[177]

The findings of the GLOBE researchers have generally been confirmed by others. For example, one study that included Japan, Mexico, South Korea, Taiwan and the US concluded that participative leadership was only effective in the countries with the smaller power distance relative to the others—South Korea and the US—and was not particularly effective in the other larger power distance countries.[178] Another study concluded that employees in larger power distance countries, such as China and Taiwan, were more likely to be willing to accept direction from supervisors without question than employees in smaller power distance countries such as the US. Chinese employees were, however, sensitive to the alignment between the directions they received and company policies but as long as the directions were supported by policy they were not likely to condition their compliance with supervisorial instructions by their own assessment as to whether or not the directions were meritorious.[179] Finally, the finding that managers in lower power distance countries rely more on their interpersonal skills for communication and are seen as more approachable is consistent with the studies mentioned above.[180] Connerley and Pedersen have advised that leaders working in high power distance countries should not to rely too much on participative practices, such as encouraging subordinates to provide opinions, solutions and participating in the making of decisions, since in those countries it is expected that the leaders will have all the answers and a

---

[175] R. House, P. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. Dorfman and V. Gupta (Eds), Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies (Thousand Oaks CA: Sage, 2004), 536.
[176] P. Dorfman, P. Hanges and F. Brodbeck, "Leadership prototypes and cultural variation: The identification of culturally endorsed implicit theories of leadership," in R. House, P. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. Dorfman and V. Gupta (Eds), Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies (Thousand Oaks CA: Sage, 2004).
[177] Id.
[178] See P. Dorfman, J. Howell, S. Hibino, J. Lee, U. Tate and A. Bautista, "Leadership in Western and Asian countries: Commonalities and differences in effective leadership processes across cultures", The Leadership Quarterly, 8(3) (1997), 233–274. Job performance data from Mexico and the US collected and analyzed in the same study led the researchers to conclude that only participative leadership had a direct and positive impact on job performance in the US and that directive and supportive leadership did not have a positive impact in that country. The findings with regard to Mexico, a country with a much higher power distance index than the US, were just the opposite and would indicate that leaders in Mexico are best advised to practice directive and supportive, rather than participative, leadership to elicit the best performance from subordinates.
[179] N. Bu, T. Craig and T. Peng, "Acceptance of supervisory direction in typical workplace situations: A comparison of US, Taiwanese and PRC employees", International Journal of Cross Cultural Management, 1(2) (2001), 131-152.
[180] L. Offermann and P. Hellmann, "Culture's consequences for leadership behavior: National values in action," Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 28(3) (1997), 342-351.

leader might be perceived as weak or incompetent if he or she goes too far in include subordinates in management of the business.[181]

Power distance has also been associated with acceptance and effectiveness of a non-GLOBE leadership style—the directive and supportive leadership style, sometimes referred to as "paternalistic", which carries with it high levels of status-orientation, support and involvement by leaders in the non-work lives of their subordinates.[182] One group of researchers found that directive leadership was likely to have a positive effect in terms of satisfaction and commitment of subordinates in larger power distance countries such as Mexico and Taiwan while not have a positive effect in countries with a smaller power distance such as Japan, South Korea and the US.[183] A number of other researchers have opined that paternalistic leadership is commonly found in developing countries which tend not only to have larger power distances but also other cultural characteristics that be conducive to accepting and embracing paternalistic leadership such as strong family bonds, a sense of fatalism and the expectation among subordinates that their organizations will take care of them and their families.[184]

The self protective leadership style was also supported and endorsed among high power distance societies particularly those societies, many of which are found in Asia, where face-saving and status-consciousness are important.[185]

§4:7   Performance orientation

High performance orientation societies have characteristics such as valuing training and development; valuing competitiveness and materialism; viewing formal feedback as necessary for performance improvement; valuing what one does more than who one is; and expecting direct and explicit communication.[186] The GLOBE researchers found a strong   and   positive   correlation   between   high   performance   orientation   and

---

[181] M. Connerley and P. Pedersen, Leadership in a diverse and multicultural environment: developing awareness, knowledge, and skills (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2005), 46.

[182] M. Dickson, D. Den Hartog and J. Mitchelson, "Research on Leadership in a Cross-Cultural Context: Making Progress, and Raising New Questions", Leadership Quarterly, 14(6) (2003), 729-769, 739.

[183] See P. Dorfman, J. Howell, S. Hibino, J. Lee, U. Tate and A. Bautista, "Leadership in Western and Asian countries: Commonalities and differences in effective leadership processes across cultures", The Leadership Quarterly, 8(3) (1997), 233–274.

[184] M. Dickson, D. Den Hartog and J. Mitchelson, "Research on Leadership in a Cross-Cultural Context: Making Progress, and Raising New Questions", Leadership Quarterly, 14(6) (2003), 729-769, 739. See also P. Dorfman and J. Howell, "Dimensions of national culture and effective leadership patterns", Advances in International Comparative Management, 3 (1988), 127-150; P. Dorfman, J. Howell, S. Hibino, J. Lee, U. Tate and A. Bautista, "Leadership in Western and Asian countries: Commonalities and differences in effective leadership processes across cultures", The Leadership Quarterly, 8(3) (1997), 233–274; and R. Kanungo and M. Mendonca, "Cultural contingencies and leadership in developing countries," Research in the Sociology of Organizations, 14 (1996), 263-295.

[185] The GLOBE researchers specifically commented that "the high power distance values and practices of Asian societies are often associated with face-saving and status-consciousness, both of which are elements of the Self-Protective leadership dimension." R. House, P. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. Dorfman and V. Gupta (Eds), Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies (Thousand Oaks CA: Sage, 2004), 707.

[186] Id. at 245.

charismatic/value-based leadership and, in fact, this style is often referred to as "performance-oriented." The researchers noted that leaders can contribute to instilling a high value on performance orientation by setting ambitious goals, communicating high expectations for their subordinates, building their subordinates' self-confidence and intellectually challenging their subordinates and that members of high performance oriented societies "seem to look to charismatic leaders who paint a picture of an ambitious and enticing future, but leave it to the people to build it".[187] The GLOBE researchers also found support for the participative leadership style was positively correlated to performance orientation.[188] The GLOBE researchers found autonomous leadership to be strongly and positively correlated with high performance orientation.

§4:8   Gender egalitarianism

In high gender egalitarian societies there is an effort to minimize gender role differences and one finds more women in positions of authority, less occupational sex segregation, similar levels of educational attainment for males and females and women being afforded greater decision-making roles in community affairs.[189] Specific leadership attributes perceived as effective in high gender egalitarian societies included foresight, enthusiasm, self-sacrifice, egalitarianism, delegation and collective orientation.[190] Charismatic/value-based leadership was supported and endorsed among high gender egalitarian societies and specific leadership attributes perceived as effective in high gender egalitarian societies included foresight, enthusiasm, self-sacrifice, egalitarianism, delegation and collective orientation.[191] Finally, support for participative leadership was positively correlated to gender egalitarianism and performance orientation.[192]

---

[187] Id. at 277-278.

[188] P. Dorfman, P. Hanges and F. Brodbeck, "Leadership prototypes and cultural variation: The identification of culturally endorsed implicit theories of leadership," in R. House, P. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. Dorfman and V. Gupta (Eds), Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies (Thousand Oaks CA: Sage, 2004).

[189] R. House, P. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. Dorfman and V. Gupta (Eds), Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies (Thousand Oaks CA: Sage, 2004), 359.

[190] Description of findings derived from M. Dickson, D. Den Hartog and J. Mitchelson, "Research on Leadership in a Cross-Cultural Context: Making Progress, and Raising New Questions", Leadership Quarterly, 14(6) (2003), 729-769, 746.

[191] Id.

[192] P. Dorfman, P. Hanges and F. Brodbeck, "Leadership prototypes and cultural variation: The identification of culturally endorsed implicit theories of leadership," in R. House, P. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. Dorfman and V. Gupta (Eds), Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies (Thousand Oaks CA: Sage, 2004).

Chapter 5
Theories and Studies of Culture and Leadership

§5:1   GLOBE researchers' integrated theory

The Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness ("GLOBE") study was arguably the most comprehensive analysis and assessment of universality and cultural congruence with respect to leadership and management practices and appeared to confirm that culture does indeed "matter" when it comes to identifying effective leadership styles and behaviors. An interesting and provocative byproduct of the GLOBE project was the development of what the GLOBE researchers referred to as an "integrated theory" regarding the relationship between societal culture, leadership attitudes and behaviors, organizational culture and leader acceptance and effectiveness that could be used as the basis for guiding future cross-cultural leadership research.[193]   The GLOBE researchers explained that the central theoretical proposition of their integrated theory was that the attributes and entities that distinguish a given societal culture from other cultures are predictive of the practices of organizations and leader attributes and behaviors that are most frequently enacted, acceptable, and effective in that culture.[194] The integrated theory consists of the following propositions[195]:

1.   Societal culture, in the form of values and practices, affect leader attributes and behaviors (i.e., "what leaders do") in that culture. The GLOBE researchers noted that substantial empirical evidence supports this proposition and that the impact of societal culture can be seen from the very beginning of any organization when the founders, as the original leaders of the organization, borrow from the societal culture they are immersed in to adopt leader behavior patterns that are favored in that culture. The process continues as the founders make a lasting imprint on the behavior of subordinate leaders and subsequent leaders through the use of selective management selection criteria, role modeling and socialization.

2.   The leadership attributes and behaviors of the founders affect organizational form, culture, and practices. As noted above, the organizational founders establish the initial culture of their organizations and then continue to influence the organizational culture on their own and through the attributes and behaviors that they transfer to the subsequent leaders of the organization that they select, train and mentor.[196]

---

[193] For a detailed discussion of the integrated theory, see R. House, N. Wright and R. Aditya. Cross-cultural research on organizational leadership: A critical analysis and a proposed theory. In P. C. Earley & M. Erez (Eds.), New Perspectives in International Industrial Organizational Psychology (San Francisco: New Lexington, 1997), 535-625. This work also includes a detailed examination of various empirical cross-cultural leadership studies.

[194] R. House, P. Hanges, S. Ruiz-Quintanilla, P. Dorfman, M. Javidan and M. Dickson, "Cultural Influences on Leadership and Organizations," Advances in Global Leadership, Volume I (Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, Inc., 1999), 171-233.

[195] Id.

[196] Substantial empirical research has been conducted regarding the proposition that the initial organizational culture is established by the organizational founders. See, e.g., E. Schein, Organizational

3.   In addition to the strong influence of the founders and other organizational leaders described above, organizational culture is also affected by the values and practices imbedded in the societal culture since the societal culture determines the common implicit leadership and organizational theories held by members of the culture and those members come to expect that their organizational leaders will design an organizational culture that is consistent with the implicit theories dictated by the societal culture.[197]

4.   Organizational form, culture and practices also affect the behaviors of the organizational leaders (i.e., the founders and subsequent leaders) who must respond to the organizational culture and alter their behaviors and leadership styles to align with the implicit leadership and organizational theories held by the organizational members based on their societal culture.[198]

5.   As time goes by societal and organizational cultures work together to influence the process by which members of the society and the organizations therein develop shared implicit leadership and organizational theories that are unique to the societal culture (i.e., the "culturally endorsed leadership theories" or "CLTs") and which differentiate it from other societal cultures.[199]

6.   While societal culture and leader attributes and behaviors are clearly important influences on organizational culture it is also apparent that organizational culture, and the behaviors and actions of organizational leaders, are affected by strategic organizational contingencies (i.e., size, technology and environment) that impose requirements that organizations must meet in order to perform effectively, compete and survive.

7.   Organizational form and practices are largely directed toward meeting the requirements imposed on organizations by their specific strategic organizational

---

culture and leadership: A dynamic view (2nd Ed.) (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1992); B. Schneider, "The people make the place", Personnel Psychology, 40 (1987), 437-454; and B. Schneider, H. Goldstein and D. Smith, "The ASA Framework: An update", Personnel Psychology, 48 (1995), 747-783. Similarly, a number of researchers have investigated the ongoing influence of the founders and their chosen subsequent leaders on organizational culture. See, e.g., K. Thompson and F. Luthans, "Organizational culture: A behavioral perspective", In B. Schneider (Ed.), Organizational Climate and Culture (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990), 319-344; G. Yukl, Leadership in organizations (3rd Ed.) (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1994); B. Bass, Leadership and performance beyond expectations (New York: Free Press, 1985); D. Miller and C. Droge, "Psychological and traditional determinants of structure", Administrative Science Quarterly, 31(4) (1986), 539-560; and E. Schein, Organizational culture and leadership: A dynamic view (2nd Ed.) (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1992).

[197] See, e.g., Lord and K. Maher, Leadership and information processing: Linking perceptions and performance (Boston: Unwin-Everyman, 1991).

[198] See, e.g., E. Schein, Organizational culture and leadership: A dynamic view (2nd Ed.) (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1992); and H. Trice and J. Beyer, The cultures of work organizations (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1984).

[199] See, e.g., R. Lord and K. Maher, Leadership and information processing: Linking perceptions and performance (Boston: Unwin-Everyman, 1991).

contingencies.[200]   However, the relationship between the choices made with regarding organizational form and practices and the strategic organizational contingencies will be moderated by cultural forces. For example, in low uncertainty avoidance cultures it can be expected that forces toward formalization will be weaker and that organizations in those cultures will tend to shy away from excessive reliance on formal rules and procedures. Similarly, organizations in lower power distance cultures are more likely to use a decentralized organizational structure for decision making and delegate authority to lower levels of what is typically a relatively flat organizational hierarchy.

8.   Strategic organizational contingencies also affect leader attributes and behavior. Leaders are selected and adjust their behaviors to meet the requirements of the strategic organizational contingencies that are confronting the organization.

9.   Leader acceptance (i.e., acceptance of the legitimacy and authority of the organization leader) is a function of the interaction between the CLTs and the attributes and behaviors of the leader. In order for the leader to be accepted his or her attributes and behaviors must be congruent with the CLTs of the organizational members.

10.   Leader effectiveness is influenced both by leader acceptance and by how well the leader deals with the applicable strategic organizational contingencies. Leaders who are not accepted will find it more difficult to influence the actions of their subordinates than leaders who are accepted. Leaders who effectively address strategic organizational contingencies will be more effective than leaders who do not.

11.   Leader effectiveness influences leader acceptance. Leaders who are effective in addressing the applicable strategic organizational contingencies will, in the long run, be accepted by all of most of his or her subordinates. Those subordinates who do not accept their leaders will eventually leave the organization voluntarily or through dismissal.

The GLOBE researchers summarized the practical consequences of their implied theory by noting that the attributes and practices that distinguish societal cultures from each other, as well as strategic organizational contingencies confronting the organization, are predictive of the attributes and behaviors of organizational leaders, and organizational practices, that are most frequently perceived as acceptable are most frequently enacted, and are most effective. The theory is presented as a systems model and the GLOBE researchers concede that it is too complex to be tested in its entirety; however, the researchers suggest that the various linkages and relationships described above can be rigorously tested and that these tests can be used to infer the validity of the model.

One of the interesting features of the model is the feasibility of incorporating the possibility of cultural change and/or changes in the applicable strategic organizational contingencies. For example, societies may be exposed to new competitive forces—and accumulate new common experiences—as a result of exposure to international media,

---

[200] See, e.g., T. Burns and G. Stalker, The management of innovation. (London: Tavistock Publications, Tavistock Centre, 1961); and P. Lawrence and J. Lorsch, Organization and environment (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1967).

cross-border commerce, international political and economic competition and other forms of interaction with other societal cultures and this may eventually lead to changes in the societal culture and/or the prevalent CLTs. Strategic organizational contingencies are also likely to change as time goes by as a result of changes in the economic or political environment or the emergence of new technologies. Leaders may respond to these changes by adopting new behaviors and/or implementing new organizational practices that initially clash with established cultural norms yet which are necessary in order for the organization to effectively meet the changing requirements of the strategic organizational contingencies. Resistance to new leadership and organizational practices that are inconsistent with the existing CLTs can be expected and has been confirmed in various research studies.[201] However, the GLOBE researchers hypothesized that eventually the new leader behaviors and practices, often with modifications to accommodate existing norms, will constitute new shared common experiences among the societal members that will be incorporated into the CLTs that distinguish and define the societal culture.

§5:2 Zagoršek's assessment of culture's influence on leadership

Several years after the GLOBE researchers published their "integrated theory", Zagoršek, who was studying the usage of five leadership practices of transformational leadership by MBA students from six countries (Argentina, India, Korea, Nigeria, Slovenia and the US)[202], provided an interesting and comprehensive list and explanation of ways in which culture can influence leadership styles and behaviors:

- Culture plays an important role in shaping the approved leadership prototype—the image of the ideal leader—of a particular society. The leadership prototype includes, among other things, a list of the leader attributes or behaviors that are presumed to be desirable and necessary in order for a leader to be effective and accepted by his or her subordinates.[203]
- Culture has a significant—many say fundamental--influence on the personality traits and work values of leaders and their subordinates in a particular society. It has been suggested that personality is the end result of a lifelong process of interaction between an individual and his or her eco-cultural and socio-cultural environment and

---

[201] See, e.g., P. Gagliardi, "The creation and change of organizational cultures: A conceptual framework", Organization Studies, 7(2) (1986), 117-134; and P. Hanges, R. Lord, D. Day, W. Sipe, W. Smith and D. Brown, "Leadership and gender bias: Dynamic measures and nonlinear modeling", in R. G. Lord (Chair), Dynamic systems, leadership perceptions, and gender effects. Symposium presented at the Twelfth Annual Conference of the Society of Industrial and Organizational Psychology (1997). Not surprisingly, resistance varies among members of the organization based on individual variables (e.g., personality, stereotypical attitudes) and situational factors (e.g., mental workload, job-context). Id.

[202] H. Zagoršek, Assessing the impact of national culture on leadership: A six nation study (September 2004) miha.ef.uni-lj.si/_dokumenti/wp/zagoršek-članek.doc [accessed February 16, 2011]

[203] See M.S. O'Connell, R. Lord and M.K. O'Connell, Differences in Japanese and American Leadership Prototypes: Implications for Cross-Cultural Training (Paper presented at the Academy of Management, San Francisco, 1990); R. House, "A Brief History of GLOBE". Journal of Managerial Psychology, 13(3/4) (1998), 230-241; and R. House, P. Hanges, A. Ruiz-Quintanilla, P. Dorfman, M. Javidan, M. Dickson et al., "Cultural Influences in Leadership and Organizations: Project GLOBE" in W. Mobley, M. Gessner and V. Arnold (Eds.), Advances in Global Leadership, Vol. 1. (Stamford, CT: JAI Press, 1999), 171-233.

these environmental influences, which differ from culture to culture, will inevitably lead to identifiable systematic differences in the personality traits of individuals that grow up in different cultural societies.[204]

- The cultural values and norms of a society determine the attitudes of leaders and their actual pattern of leadership behaviors. Among other things, cultural values define societal norms regarding the ways in which members of the society, including leaders and their subordinates, relate to one another and these norms specify acceptable forms of leadership behaviors. In some cases, norms relating to leadership behaviors will actually be formalized in the form of laws that leaders must adhere to as they exercise their powers to influence the actions of their subordinates.[205]

- Just as cultural values and norms impact the attitudes and behaviors of leaders, they also influence how subordinates perceive and ultimately accept or reject the behaviors and practices of their leaders. Zagoršek noted that research has confirmed that "[f]ollowers across nations differ in their preferences for, acceptance of, and performance responses to different communication patterns, task- versus person-orientation, close versus general supervision, democratic versus autocratic leadership, and usage of participatory practices".[206]

- Consistent with the points discussed above, culture is an important determinant of the effectiveness of particular leadership styles and behaviors and leader behaviors that are inconsistent with societal norms and values and/or with the implicit leadership theories of subordinates in the society are likely to be ineffective and ultimately lower the morale of the subordinates and harm the productivity and performance of the organizational unit that the ineffective leader oversees.

- Culture is important in providing leaders with guidance regarding the outcomes and results that they should try to achieve through their decisions, actions and behaviors. Leaders must understand the desired goals and objectives of their subordinates and realize that there are differences among societies in this regard. For example, subordinates in India appear to value job satisfaction more than productivity, British workers are most interested in self-actualization and the French seek good working relations and security.[207]

- Culture impacts how leaders are selected and accepted as "legitimate" within societies. As Zagoršek explained ". . . in Egalitarian, Individualistic, low Power Distance societies the leader usually has to "earn his title" – he or she is "appointed" by the followers, who admire his or her qualities and achievements. In more traditional, Collectivistic, and high Power Distance countries, the leadership role is usually ascribed to an individual by the nature of his or her status (acquired by birth, kinship, gender, age, education, or connections)". Research has also identified other

---

[204] J. Berry, Y. Poortinga and M. Segall et al., Cross-Cultural Psychology: Research and Applications (2nd ed.) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

[205] G. Yukl, Leadership in Organizations (5th ed.) (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2002).

[206] R. House, N. Wright and R. Aditya, "Cross-Cultural Research on Organizational Leadership: A Critical Analysis and a Proposed Theory" in P. Earley and M. Erez (Eds.), New Perspectives in International Industrial Organizational Psychology (San Francisco: New Lexington, 1997), 535-625.

[207] D. Sinha, "Psychology in the Context of the Third World Development", International Journal of Psychology, 19 (1984), 17-29 (India); and R. Kanungo and R. Wright, "A Cross-Cultural Comparative Study of Managerial Job Attitudes", Journal of International Business Studies, 14 (1983), 115-129 (covering Canada, France, Japan and Great Britain).

factors that are generally more important than others in particular societies in influencing how leaders are selected in those societies including education, class, occupation, ownership, and technical expertise and presumably these preferences are determined to some degree by the society's cultural environment.[208]

- Differences among societies have been identified with respect to the bases of power and influence tactics that leaders rely upon in order to be effective. In the US, for example, subordinate effectiveness was found to be positively correlated with supervisor use of referent power while in Bulgaria subordinate effectiveness is positively related to use the use legitimate power by supervisors.[209]

- The nature of the relationship between leaders and their subordinates is also impacted by cultural factors. In some societies, for example, the relationship is akin to a parent and child and the subordinate is dependent on the leader and the leader is expected to attend to and satisfy the needs of his or her subordinate. In more egalitarian societies, however, there are far fewer distinctions between leaders and subordinates and the leader is often simply "first among equals".

- Culture provides context for the styles and behaviors of leaders and thus provides a way to identify whether a particular action will be consider appropriate or inappropriate within a society. For example, in South East Asia attendance by a leader at a subordinate's family celebration will be considered "supportive" as will a leader's discussion of the personal problems of one subordinate with other subordinates in Japan; however, such behaviors by a leader in US would likely be considered annoying or offensive by the subordinate whose personal space has been intruded upon by the leader.

- Culture provides a basis for identifying and defining what Zagoršek referred to as "emic conceptions of leadership" in a society (i.e., how the concept of leadership is perceived in the society). Good leaders understand what subordinates in their society expect of them and seek to behave in ways that are consistent with those expectations. Zagoršek cited the work of Sinha on the "nurturant-task leader" of India, which Sinha described as someone who "understands the expectations of his subordinates. He knows that they relish dependency and personalized relationship, accept his authority and look towards him for guidance and direction".[210]

Zagoršek conceded that support for the general proposition that culture does influence the styles and behaviors of leaders comes from a number of studies that have examined behaviors and attitudes of managers in different countries and the effectiveness of various leadership styles in different cultural environments. Referring to the GLOBE researchers, Zagoršek noted that they had identified "[d]ifferences in modal patterns of

---

[208] R. House, N. Wright and R. Aditya, "Cross-Cultural Research on Organizational Leadership: A Critical Analysis and a Proposed Theory" in P. Earley and M. Erez (Eds.), New Perspectives in International Industrial Organizational Psychology (San Francisco: New Lexington, 1997), 535-625; D. Boyd, "Research Note: The Educational Background of a Selected Group of England's Leaders", Sociology, 8 (1974), 305-312; D. McClelland, The Achieving Society (New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1961); S. Lee and G. Schwendiman, Japanese Management: Cultural and Environmental Considerations (New York: Praeger, 1982).

[209] M. Rahim, D. Antonioni, K. Krumov and S. Ilieva, "Power, Conflict, and Effectiveness: A Cross-Cultural Study in the United States and Bulgaria", European Psychologist, 5(1) (2000), 28-33.

[210] D. Sinha, The Nurturant Task Leader (New Delhi: Concept Publishing House, 1980).

leadership behaviors across cultures . . . with respect to individualistic versus team-orientation, particularism versus universalism, performance- versus maintenance-orientation, paternalism, reliance on personal abilities, subordinates or rules, leader influence processes, decision-making, and service orientation".[211]   Another researcher found that managers from Japan spent more time on single tasks than managers from the US.[212]   A study of managers from Korea, Mexico, Taiwan and the US identified clear differences among those countries with respect to the use and effectiveness of the participative leadership style and the degree to which managers shared and controlled information, sought and accepted input from subordinates on decisions and established and maintained power distance in their relationships with their subordinates.[213]   A number of researchers have identified societal differences with respect to the use and effectiveness of transformational, charismatic, inspirational and visionary leadership styles and behaviors.[214]   In addition, several studies have concluded that coercive, directive and autocratic leadership styles are more commonly found in high power distance countries and that top managers in those countries are more likely to rely upon formal rules and procedures to direct day-to-day activities and are less likely than their colleagues in low power distance countries to seek input from subordinates on how to deal with day-to-day events.[215]   Finally, one study found differences among executives

---

[211] H. Zagoršek, Assessing the impact of national culture on leadership: A six nation study (September 2004) miha.ef.uni-lj.si/_dokumenti/wp/zagoršek-članek.doc [accessed February 16, 2011] (citing R. House, N. Wright and R. Aditya, "Cross-Cultural Research on Organizational Leadership: A Critical Analysis and a Proposed Theory" in P. Earley and M. Erez (Eds.), New Perspectives in International Industrial Organizational Psychology (San Francisco: New Lexington, 1997), 535-625).

[212] R. Doktor, "Culture and Management of Time: A Comparison of Japanese and American Top Management Top Practice", Asia Pacific Journal of Management, 1 (1983), 65-70.

[213] P. Dorfman and J. Howell, "Leadership in Western and Asian Countries: Commonalities and Differences in Effective Leadership Processes across Cultures", Leadership Quarterly, 8(3) (1997), 233-275 (participative leadership was much more prevalent among US managers than among managers from the other countries; Taiwanese managers used authoritarian decision styles, maintained power distance and tightly controlled information; and participative leadership was ineffective in Mexico due to high collectiveness, low levels of trust and the absence of organizational and relational structures that would facilitate and support participation).

[214] See, e.g., J. Kouzes and B. Posner, The Leadership Practices Inventory: The Theory and Evidence Behind the Five Practices of Exemplary Leaders (2002) http://media.wiley.com/assets/61/06/lc_jb_appendix.pdf [accessed August 4, 2003] (visionary, experimenting and supportive behaviors, all typically associated with transformational leadership practices, were used more frequently by US managers than by managers from Switzerland); K. Kuchinke, "Leadership and Culture: Work-Related Values and Leadership Styles among One Company's U.S. and German Telecommunication Employees", Human Resource Development Quarterly (1999) (US managers and employees scored significantly higher than their German counterparts in the same global telecommunications company on charisma and inspirational motivation scales).

[215] B. Bass, Bass & Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research, and Managerial Applications (3rd ed.) (New York: Free Press, 1990); G. Hofstede, Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind (London; New York: McGraw-Hill, 1991); M. Dickson, D. Den Hartog and J. Mitchelson, "Research on Leadership in a Cross-Cultural Context: Making Progress, and Raising New Questions", Leadership Quarterly, 14(6) (2003), 729-769; and P. Smith, M. Peterson, S. Schwartz et al., "Cultural Values, Sources of Guidance, and Their Relevance to Managerial Behavior - a 47 Nation Study", Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 33(2) (2002), 188-208..

from different cultural backgrounds with respect to openness to change in leadership profiles.[216]

While concluding that culture did have an impact on leadership styles and practices, Zagoršek argued that it was important to note that the results of multifactor analyses of data collected in numerous surveys showed that the relative strength of the influence of culture on leadership is small and that, in general, culture at the country levels does not explain that much of the variation in the usage of leadership practices found to occur in different countries.[217] Zagoršek suggested that there were a number of other important variables aside from culture that contribute to the leadership process and its outcomes including, for example, "[c]haracteristics of the leader (personality, capabilities, intelligence, motives, values, and beliefs of leaders), characteristics of followers (their personalities, needs and expectations, skills and expertise, task commitment and effort, and attributions about the leader), and characteristics of the situation (type of organization, structure and type of work unit, task structure and complexity, environmental uncertainty, and organizational and national culture)".[218] However, while the direct influence of culture on leadership styles appears to be relatively small, perhaps less than expected by some, it does appear have a much higher explanatory value with respect to variation than other variables such as gender, age or work experience and, of course, culture also comes into play indirectly to the extent that it may impact other variables such as the values of leaders and/or the expectations and norms of followers.

§5:3   Ardichvili and Kuchinke

Ardichvili and Kuchinke, who studied the relationship between cultural dimensions and leadership styles in four former countries of the Soviet Union (Georgia, Kazakhstan,

---

[216] G. Ekvall and J. Arvonen, "Change-Centered Leadership: An Extent Ion of the Two-Dimensional Model. Scandinavian Journal of Management", (7) (1991), 17-26 (also finding that culture had a stronger influence on leadership profiles of executives than their professional experience)

[217] H. Zagoršek, Assessing the impact of national culture on leadership: A six nation study (September 2004) miha.ef.uni-lj.si/_dokumenti/wp/zagoršek‑članek.doc [accessed February 16, 2011]   Zagoršek reported that Haire et al. found that 28% of the questionnaire response variance in their study of managers' need hierarchies in different countries could be accounted for by nationality (culture) and that 52% of the variance in managers' attitudes in a multi-country study conducted by Griffeth et al. could be accounted for by nationality. See M. Haire, E. Ghiselli and L. Porter, Managerial thinking: An international study (New York: Wiley, 1966); and R. Griffeth, P. Hom, A. Denisi and W. Kirchner, A multivariate, multinational comparison of managerial attitudes. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management, Detroit (August 1980). However, in his own study Zagoršek found that, in general, culture explained between 3% to 8% of the variation in the usage of leadership practices and the GLOBE researchers found that cultural values on both societal and organizational level accounted mostly for between 7% and 27% of the total organizational variance for the four culturally endorsed GLOBE leadership styles. See R. House, P. Hanges, A. Ruiz-Quintanilla, P. Dorfman, M. Javidan, M. Dickson et al., "Cultural Influences in Leadership and Organizations: Project GLOBE", in W. Mobley, M. Gessner and V. Arnold (Eds.), Advances in Global Leadership, Vol 1. (Stamford, Connecticut: JAI Press, 1999), 171-233. Zagoršek noted that these results appeared to indicate that cultural variation in organizational leadership styles and behaviors may be much smaller than variation in managerial attitudes or values, which were the focus of the studies conducted by Haire et al. and Griffeth et al.

[218] H. Zagoršek, Assessing the impact of national culture on leadership: A six nation study (September 2004) miha.ef.uni-lj.si/_dokumenti/wp/zagoršek‑članek.doc [accessed February 16, 2011]

Kyrgyzstan and Russia), found that while the cultural dimensions that they used predicted leadership styles they accounted for only a small portion of the variance and they suggested that this might mean that "other factors could have stronger effects on leadership than the socio-cultural dimensions".[219] Ardichvili and Kuchinke also noted the possibility that by relying on Hofstede's five dimensional model they may not have included the "whole universe of socio-cultural dimensions relevant to leadership" and pointed out that the use of models suggested by other researchers that break out dimensions such as individualism-collectivism into multiple components might unearth more information.[220] Ardichvili and Kuchinke have suggested that in light of evidence that the relationship between societal culture and leadership styles may not be that strong further work should be done to investigate the influence of culture on leadership at other levels such as organizational, industry and professional cultures.[221]

§5:4   Muczyk and Holt

Muczyk and Holt made several general, and tentative, recommendations regarding the most effective leadership styles for various regions around the world based on the predominant cultural characteristics in those regions identified by various researchers.[222] They began with "mainstream leadership constructs developed from North American experiences" and integrated them with research on cultural imperatives completed using a

---

[219] A. Ardichvili and K. Kuchinke, "Leadership styles and cultural values among managers and subordinates: a comparative study of four countries of the former Soviet Union, Germany and the US," Human Resource Development International, 5(1) (2002): 99-117, 113.

[220] Id. Ardichvili and Kuchinke noted that Triandis had proposed that individualism and collectivism are unique constructs that needed to be split into separate continua as opposed to the approach taken by Hofstede, who viewed individualism and collectivism as poles of a single continuum; and that Triandis had also suggested that both individualism and collectivism may be multifaceted dimensions consisting of more than one component. See, e.g., H. Triandis, Individualism and Collectivism (Boulder, CO: Westview, 1995).

[221] A. Ardichvili and K. Kuchinke, "Leadership styles and cultural values among managers and subordinates: a comparative study of four countries of the former Soviet Union, Germany and the US," Human Resource Development International, 5(1) (2002): 99-117, 113-114.

[222] J. Muczyk and D. Holt, "Toward a Cultural Contingency Model of Leadership", Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 14(4) (May 2008), 277-286, 283 (Table 5: Examples of Regional Leadership Styles Based on Regional Cultural Determinants). Muczyk and Holt argued that "[t]here is considerable support for a global leadership contingency model" and noted that their recommendations were inspired by the work of several researchers, including results and interpretations reported in F. Brodbeck, M. Frese, S. Akerblom, G. Audia, G. Bakacsi and H. Bendova, et al. "Cultural variation of leadership prototypes across 22 European countries", Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 73 (2000), 1-29; M. Javidan, P. Dorfman, M. de Luque and R. House, "In the eye of the beholder: Cross cultural lessons in leadership from Project GLOBE", Academy of Management Perspectives (February 2006), 67-90; P. Koopman, D. Den Hartog, E. Konrad, S. Akerblom, G. Audia, G. Bakacsi, et al., "National culture and leadership profiles in Europe: Some results from the GLOBE study", European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 8 (1999), 503-520; A. Laurent, "The cultural diversity of Western conceptions of management", International Studies of Management and Organizations, Spring-Summer, 1983, 75-96; and S. Ronen and O. Shenkar, "Clustering countries on attitudinal dimensions: A review and synthesis", Academy of Management Review, July 1985, 449. Muczyk and Holt also cautioned that there are obviously cultural differences within the "country clusters" and that it is necessary and recommended to match the leadership characteristics used in their model to the "specific cultural imperatives" of each country.

wide and robust array of multinational samples.[223]   They noted that the volume of research threatened to create a global contingency model that might well be far too complex and difficult to be of any practical use to practitioners (i.e., organizational leaders and managers) and sought to create a "simplified version" that could be readily applied.[224] They also cautioned that not all leadership characteristics were a function of cultural factors and that other things, such as attributes of subordinates and requirements of the particulars situation, needed to be taken into account when identifying the most appropriate and potentially effective leadership behavior.[225]   Finally, like others, Muczyk and Holt questioned whether it was realistic to expect that leaders could be flexible enough to modify their styles whenever cultural conditions dictated the need for a change and suggested that organizations might be better off taking the styles of their leaders as "givens" and then investing their time and effort into placing them into cultural situations where those styles would be appreciated and effective, thus taking advantage of the pre-existing "strengths" of their leaders.[226]   Their recommendations for specific geographic regions can be summarized as follows:

- *US and Canada*: With regard to the US and Canada, Muczyk and Holt suggested that the Muczyk/Reimann model would be applicable in selecting the leadership style that should be used in particular circumstances.
- *Middle East*: Muczyk and Holt suggested that the autocratic leadership style was generally recommended in the Middle East combined with "heavy doses of concern for production and consideration". They noted that "[i]n the Middle East, with the exception of Israel, there are no democratic traditions" and that "the touchstone of good leadership in that part of the world seems to have revolved around the concept of justice, not democracy".[227]   As far as rewards are concerned, Middle Eastern cultures are probably more receptive to recognition based on group and organizational performance measures rather than on individual performance. Muczyk and Holt also commented that leaders should include family members of subordinates in organizational social functions in the Middle East.
- *Asia (excluding Japan)*: According to Muczyk and Holt, the preferred leadership style in Asia, other than in Japan, would be "autocratic with an emphasis on consideration".[228]   In light of the collectivist nature of these societies, it is not surprising that group and/or organizational measures of performance are recommended as the basis for rewards.

---

[223] J. Muczyk and D. Holt, "Toward a Cultural Contingency Model of Leadership", Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 14(4) (May 2008), 277-286, 278.

[224] Id. at 284.

[225] Id.

[226] Id.

[227] Id. at 283. They noted, for example, the absence of democratic traditions in China, including in the workplace. Even in countries that had been exposed to democratic institutions, such as India, the efficacy of Western leadership styles might be problematic given that democracy was not introduced to the workplace in those countries. Id. at 278.

[228] Id. at 283. They noted that the region had a history of autocratic rule and that "[a]n autocrat ruled so long as he was on good behavior . . . [i]n other words, if he treated his subjects in an evenhanded way, honored their traditions, did not publicly flout the Koran, and did not levy onerous taxes, he was expected to rule for life". Id.

- *Japan*: Most researchers who have worked to identify "country clusters" based on cultural dimensions have concluded that Japan, although planted firmly in the middle of the Asian geographic zone, should be treated differently than other countries in Asia.[229] Muczyk and Holt recommended that rather than the "autocratic" style preferred elsewhere in Asia, leaders in Japan should apply "democratic leadership . . . with emphasis on consideration". Interestingly, Muczyk and Holt questioned whether there was any need to tie rewards to performance since workers in Japan appeared to be condition to "do the right things because they are right not because of the rewards associated with correct behavior".
- *Western Europe*: For those countries in Western Europe with cultural characteristics similar to those found in the US and Canada, Muczyk and Holt recommended that the leadership style should be determined based on the Muczyk/Reimann model. However, there are some Western European countries that have a relatively higher regard for hierarchy and "chain of command" and Muczyk and Holt prescribed a leadership style for these countries that was more autocratic.
- *Eastern Europe*: While many countries in Eastern Europe are trying to create economic systems similar to those found in Western Europe, recent history is still hard to overcome and Muczyk and Holt recommend that for the time being it may still make sense to use and autocratic leadership style coupled with concern for production. As for reward systems, individual performance measures may be used.
- *Southern Europe*: Muczyk and Holt recommended autocratic leadership in Southern European countries combined with a heavy emphasis on consideration and reward systems based on group or organizational measures of performance.
- *Central and South America*: Muczyk and Holt recommended autocratic leadership with emphasis on concern for production in Central and South American countries; however, they cautioned that leaders should not ignore the need for consideration in these countries. Reward systems in Central and South America would best when they are based on group or organizational measures of performance.

§5:5   Hofstede on cross-cultural transfer of US leadership theories

A good deal of the research activities conducted in the field of comparative management studies seeks to identify and explain similarities and differences among various management systems.[230] In addition, the field has included the pursuit of universally, or at least broadly, applicable management systems, philosophies, values and practices that

---

[229] A number of explanations have been advanced for Japan's apparent differences from the rest of Asia, including its geographic isolation—a group of islands disconnected from the rest of Asia; its long period of diplomatic isolation from other countries, not just in Asia but all around the world; and its language, which is only spoken in Japan. Japan is also unique among countries in Asia because of it intense exposure to US institutions and values after the end of World War II, a factor that likely contributes to the heightened interest and acceptance of "democracy" in Japan in comparison to many of its Asian neighbors. For further discussion of some of the issues associated with placing Japan within clusters of culturally similar countries, see "Globalization: A Library of Resources for Sustainable Entrepreneurs" prepared and distributed by the Sustainable Entrepreneurship Project (www.seproject.org).

[230] For further discussion of research activities in the area comparative management studies, see "Globalization: A Library of Resources for Sustainable Entrepreneurs" prepared and distributed by the Sustainable Entrepreneurship Project (www.seproject.org).

can be transferred effectively across cultures with predictable and desired results. The transfer is a complex process involving not only the technical aspects of a particular management system but also verification that the application of the principles associated with that system is having the desired behavioral impact in the specific cultural and environmental context in which the transfer is occurring.

Long before the GLOBE researchers embarked on their comprehensive analysis and assessment of the influence of culture on leadership, Hofstede had put forth a number of arguments regarding attempts to transfer US leadership theories to other countries. In fact, one of the primary objectives that Hofstede had when first publishing his research results was to demonstrate how the cultural environment identified in a particular country influenced the theories of leadership and management practices that were developed and used in those countries. His view was quite clear on this matter—theories of leadership and management reflect the cultural environment in which they were written—and Hofstede believed this was not only true of theories produced in the US, by far the largest producer and attempted exporter of management theories in the world, but also of ideas developed in centuries past by Old World philosophers living and writing in ancient Greece (Plato), medieval and Renaissance England (More) and Italy (Machiavelli) and France (Fayol) and Germany (Weber) during the early 20th Century.[231] Hofstede also noted that the views of leadership and management theorists reflect their own economic and educational background, as well as national factors, and that it was therefore not surprising to him that most modern theories of leadership and management reflected a "national intellectual middle-class culture background" since management pundits tend to be "middle-class intellectuals".[232]

Assuming for the moment that Hofstede is correct about the strong impact that a theorist's cultural background has on his or her theories of leadership and management the next question, which was posed by Hofstede himself, is "[t]o what extent do theories developed in one country and reflecting the cultural boundaries of that country apply to other countries"?[233] Theorists seeking, and believing in, universal leadership or management principles implicitly took the position that their theories could be applied in every country regardless of the cultural dimensions that dominate in that country. However, is it really true that US theories of leadership and management can be effectively applied in India, Japan or poor developing countries? Hofstede argued that at the time of his survey little work had been done on this question and that the cultural dimensions that he had identified provided the tools necessary to analyze whether well-known US theories of leadership, motivation and organization could be readily applied in other countries with different cultural dimensions.

Hofstede argued that the theories regarding leadership that are developed and used in a particular country are determined by the cultural values of that country, particularly the position of that country on the power distance axis. He first illustrated this idea by

---

[231] G. Hofstede, "Motivation, Leadership and Organization: Do American Theories Apply Abroad"," Organization Dynamics, 9:1980, 42-63, 49-50.
[232] Id. at 50.
[233] Id.

looking back in history to the well-known, yet often criticized, management techniques espoused by Machiavelli in Italy in the late 15th and early 16th centuries and pointing out that the Machiavellian practices of deceit, bribery, manipulation and murder were consistent with the then-current Italian society in which power distances were quite large. Hofstede contrasted Machiavelli to the contemporaneous writings of Sir Thomas More in England whose call for consensus in *Utopia* was to be expected given the lower power distance in the cultural environment in which he lived and taught. Interestingly, the success of both Machiavelli and More in their own time depended largely on political considerations—Machiavelli was able to survive through cunning and pragmatism while More lost his life because his ideas were perceived as too threatening and critical by those in power over the country.[234]

Hofstede then turned to several popular leadership theories that has been developed in the US and which were being packaged and promoted as possible solutions for managers operating in other countries including McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y, Likert's System Four management model and Blake and Mouton's Grid Theory.[235] Hofstede grouped all of these theories into what he referred to as the "participative management" school since the common thread among them was a recommendation that subordinates be afforded opportunities to participate in the management decisions made by their leaders; however, the onus was on the leader/manager to initiate this process as part of his/her leadership style. Hofstede explained that these forms of participative management theories could be expected from a society such as the US given its middle position on the power distance axis (15th out of the 40 countries in the survey) but that such theories would likely not be comfortable in countries appearing at other points on the axis. For example, large power distance countries, such as France and Italy, which perhaps not fully embracing the draconian principles of Machiavelli would nonetheless have little interest in the type of subordinate participation in management advocated in the US. On the other end of the spectrum, however, countries with smaller power distances than the US (e.g., Germany, Israel, Norway and Sweden) would not only endorse participative management but would incorporate mechanisms for subordinate initiation, referred to as "industrial democracy," that were not popular in the US and often resisted by industrial leaders. Interestingly, the position of small power distance countries on the uncertainty avoidance axis appeared to impact how they implemented industrial democracy—weak uncertainty avoidance countries like Sweden, more risk tolerant, relied on small and informal initiatives at the local level before formalizing matters in the form of legislation; and strong uncertainty avoidance countries like Germany that are used to relying on extensive sets of written rules and regulations would pass laws first and then work to have them implemented on a day-to-day basis at the organizational level.[236]

---

[234] Id. at 56.

[235] For further discussion of the leadership theories mentioned in the text, see "Leadership Styles" in "Leadership: A Library of Resources for Sustainable Entrepreneurs" prepared and distributed by the Sustainable Entrepreneurship Project and "Human Resources: A Library of Resources for Sustainable Entrepreneurs" prepared and distributed by the Sustainable Entrepreneurship Project (www.seproject.org).

[236] G. Hofstede, "Motivation, Leadership and Organization: Do American Theories Apply Abroad"," Organization Dynamics, 9:1980, 42-63, 56-57.

Hofstede did astutely point out that managers cannot simply choose the style of leadership that they prefer to use and expect that it will be accepted and appreciated by subordinates and he criticized management theorists as being naïve if they thought that effective leadership was simply up to the preferences and talents of the manager. Hofstede noted that the measures of power distance generated from this survey were based on the values of people as subordinates and not on the values of their leaders and this was important since the cultural conditioning of the subordinates determined how they would react to the leadership styles of their managers.[237] He then described some of the key attributes of "subordinateship" that he believed could generally be found in countries at different levels of power distance. For example, in countries, such as the US, where the level of power distance could be categorized as "medium", Hofstede argued that subordinates have medium dependence needs generally and medium dependence needs toward their superiors and that the following is also typically true: subordinates expect superiors to consult with them but will accept autocratic behavior as well; the ideal type of superior for most people is a resourceful democrat; laws and rules apply to everyone but a certain level of privileges for superiors is considered to be normal; and status symbols for superiors contribute moderately to their authority and will be accepted by subordinates.[238]

Hofstede specifically criticized McGregor, Likert and Blake and Mouton for failing to take into account the cultural profile of the subordinates who are expected to respond to the styles and behaviors of their leaders and argued that their prescriptions for how organizational leaders should act would have limited effectiveness outside of the US and those other countries, such as Australia, Canada, Denmark, Israel or New Zealand, where the power distance level fell into the small or medium category.[239] He suggested that US managers asked to serve in countries with different power distances would need to learn how to adapt their managerial styles to suit the particular environment in which they were operating and the typical expectations of subordinates in that environment regarding the authority and status of their leaders and the degree to which subordinates participate in the managerial decision making processes.

Hofstede first considered the difficulties that US managers might face in countries, such as Hong Kong, Indonesia, Mexico, the Philippines, Singapore and Venezuela[240], where

---

[237] Id. at 57.

[238] Id. at 61.

[239] Id. at 57. Power distance was also a predictor of endorsement of the participative leadership style in the GLOBE country clusters and the GLOBE researchers found that the participative leadership style was endorsed in those GLOBE country clusters where small power distance was the norm—the Anglo, Germanic Europe and Nordic Europe clusters. See P. Dorfman, P. Hanges and F. Brodbeck, "Leadership prototypes and cultural variation: The identification of culturally endorsed implicit theories of leadership," in R. House, P. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. Dorfman and V. Gupta (Eds), Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies (Thousand Oaks CA: Sage, 2004).

[240] Id. at 51. Just as the GLOBE researchers found that participative leadership was endorsed in country clusters where small power distances were more prevalent their results also indicated that the participative leadership style was not embraced as strongly in country clusters whose members had larger power distances scores such as the Confucian Asia, East Europe, Middle Eastern and Southern Asia clusters. See P. Dorfman, P. Hanges and F. Brodbeck, "Leadership prototypes and cultural variation: The identification of culturally endorsed implicit theories of leadership," in R. House, P. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. Dorfman and

the level of power distance could be categorized as "large". Hofstede claimed that subordinates in these countries have strong dependence needs generally and strong dependence needs toward their superiors and that the following is also typically true: subordinates expect superiors to act autocratically; the ideal type of superior for most people is a benevolent autocrat or paternalist; everybody expects superiors to enjoy privileges and laws and rules differ for superiors and subordinates; and status symbols are very important and contribute strongly to the superior's authority with the subordinates.[241] Hofstede explained that in order for US managers, or managers from other small or medium power distance countries, to be effective in these countries they needed to learn how to behave in a more autocratic fashion and then referred to the colonial history in most Western countries as evidence that this transition generally can be completed.[242]

Things become more difficult for US managers when they move to countries, such as Austria, Denmark, Germany, Israel and Sweden[243], where the level of power distance could be categorized as "small". Hofstede claimed that that subordinates in these countries have weak dependence needs generally and weak dependence needs toward their superiors and that the following is also typically true: subordinates expect superiors to consult them and may rebel or strike if superiors are not seen as staying within their legitimate role; the ideal type of superior is a loyal democrat; laws and rules apply to all and privileges for superiors are not considered to be acceptable; and status symbols are frowned upon and will quickly be criticized and attacked by subordinates.[244] The problem for US managers in these countries lies in their ability to understand and accept the notion of "industrial democracy" that has caught on in these countries and which essentially rejects the principle of managerial prerogative, an idea which is fundamental to the way in which US managers think and operate. US managers in small power distance countries must learn to cope with unfamiliar processes that require consultation with subordinates and often allow subordinates, acting collectively in groups, to take the initiative in areas where the managers are used to leading in a directive fashion.[245]

V. Gupta (Eds), Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies (Thousand Oaks CA: Sage, 2004).

[241] Id. at 61. Adler also examined the same popular US leadership theories that Hofstede focused on and reached similar conclusions; specifically, that the participatory management styles widely lauded in the US would not be appropriate for high power distance cultures like China and Japan since employees in those countries prefer and expect leadership to come from their supervisors and would be uncomfortable with the delegation of discretionary decision making authority that is a core feature of participatory management. See N. Adler, International Dimensions of Organizational Behavior (2nd Ed) (Boston: PWS-Kent Publishing Co., 1991), 14-178.

[242] Id. at 57. Hofstede suggested that subordinates in large power distance countries may be even more comfortable with superiors who are "real autocrats" (i.e., they come from countries where the power distance is also large) than with superiors from lower power distance countries who are attempting to act in a manner that is out of character for them.

[243] Id. Hofstede found the largest power distance indexes in countries such as Malaysia, China, Hong Kong, Indonesia, the Philippines and Singapore; a number of Arab countries; and in Latin and South American countries such as Guatemala, Mexico, Panama and Venezuela. Id. at 51.

[244] Id. at 61.

[245] Id. at 57-58. The difficulties associated with understanding and executing leadership styles that are most likely to be effective in a particular cultural environment should not be underestimated. In fact, in a large survey of managers from 20 countries Geletkanycz found that openness to change in strategies and

Hofstede also commented on how well one might expect Drucker's well-known "management by objectives" ("MBO") to be accepted in cultural environments other than the US. In brief, MBO, which was first introduced by Drucker in the 1950s[246] and was much discussed during the time that Hofstede first released his survey results, was based on the principle that individual efforts must be put together to achieve a common goal known to, and accepted by, everyone in the organization and required the completion of the following steps: organizational objectives must be defined at the very top of the hierarchy, such as the board level; management roles and activities should be analyzed to that duties and responsibilities relating to achievement of the objectives can be properly allocated among the individual managers; performance standards should be established; managers and subordinates should agree upon and define specific objectives for the activities of the subordinates; the targets set for each subordinate should be aligned with the larger objectives of the organization; and management information systems should be created to monitor performance and the actual relationship of individual achievement to organizational objectives.

Hofstede argued that, not surprisingly, several of the assumptions underlying MBO could be traced to cultural dimensions that were comfortable for the US. First of all, MBO, which contemplates a good deal of dialogue between organizational units, and managers and subordinates, regarding objectives, targets and standards assumes that subordinates have sufficient independence and confidence to engage in meaningful negotiations with persons higher in the organizational hierarchy (i.e., small or medium power distance). Second, MBO assumes that everyone in the organization, subordinates and their managers, is willing to take risks (i.e., weak uncertainty avoidance). Finally, MBO assumes that subordinates and managers all believe that performance, as measured by achievement of organizational goals and related individual targets, is important (i.e., high masculinity). He then discussed how well MBO might be received in countries with a different cultural profile. In Germany, for example, Hofstede noted that its small power distance should support and welcome dialogue within the organization regarding goals and objectives but that problems might arise with respect to acceptance of risk given that Germany is a much stronger uncertainty avoidance society.[247] Attempts to implement MBO in France were a failure in Hofstede's view because France is a large power distance society in which managers are uncomfortable with decentralizing authority and subordinates do not expect managers to delegate authority and, in fact, prefer that

---

leadership styles varied among managers with different cultural values, a finding that supports the proposition that culture plays a much more important role than professional training and background in influencing the styles and practices of managers. M. Geletkanycz, "The salience of 'culture's consequences': The effects of cultural values on top executive commitment to the status quo," Strategic Management Journal, 18(8) (1997), 615-634.

[246] P. Drucker, The Practice of Management (New York, Harper & Row, 1954).

[247] G. Hofstede, "Motivation, Leadership and Organization: Do American Theories Apply Abroad","" Organization Dynamics, 9:1980, 42-63, 58. Hofstede does point out that MBO can fit well with German small power distance/strong uncertainty avoidance to the extent that mutually agreed upon objectives provide subordinates with direction that alleviates stress while also removing the threat of arbitrary authority exercised by superiors. Hofstede cites studies of the use of MBO in German-speaking countries that illustrate a preference for the elaborate formal information systems suggested by Drucker and an emphasis on group objectives that is consistent with the low individualism values in these countries. Id.

managers provide direction through a hierarchical structure that reduces stress and anxiety by its very predictability.[248]

---

[248] Id. at 58-59. Initially it was thought that MBO might be a means for implementing what some believed was a long overdue democratization of management processes within French organizations; however, the cultural aversion to participatory management practices, shared by persons at all levels of the organizational hierarchy, proved too difficult to overcome in most instances and Hofstede reported that the French version of MBO—referred to as DPPO (Direction Participative par Objectifs)—had largely been discredited by the time that he first published his survey results at the end of the 1970s. Id.

Chapter 6
Culture and Leadership in Developing Countries

§6:1   Introduction

The field of "leadership studies" has long been primarily focused on Western leadership styles and practices.[249] This occurred for various reasons including the location of the critical mass of researchers in the US and the fact that most companies operated primarily in the US with some cautious expansion into foreign markets with similar linguistic and cultural traditions. However, several factors—globalization of the workforce, expansion of operations into numerous around the world and exposure to increase global competition—has forced leadership scholars to incorporate culture into their research and theories since leaders of businesses of all sizes in all countries must be prepared to interact with customers and other business partners from different cultures and leaders of larger companies have the additional challenge of managing multinational organizations and aligning a global corporate culture with multiple and diverging national cultures. In addition, there has been a growing recognition that the study of leadership in developing countries, and training of prospective leaders in those countries, is important because leaders in developing countries can, "by creating vision, direction and collective purposes", play a pivotal role in resolving multiple collection action problems that impede social development and economic growth in those countries.[250]

It is now well accepted that leadership "matters" when it comes to economic growth and development, a conclusion that follows the previous realization that institutions are important contributors to the social and economic progress of developing countries. However, scholars such as de Ver have been critical of research efforts relating to leadership in developing countries, arguing that "many of the conceptions of leadership in the literature are Western-oriented, universalist or individualistic, and there are few conceptions which either incorporate a political understanding of leadership as a process or which have developmental salience".[251] She has also expressed a concern that little analysis has been conducted on how leadership can be practiced in what she describes as "the very often unstable, hybrid and evolving institutional contexts which characterize the condition of many developing countries". She counseled that leadership needed to be understood as a political process, particularly in developing countries, and leadership occurred "within a given indigenous configuration of power, authority and legitimacy, shaped by history, institutions, goals and political culture". She noted that in developing countries, leaders must be able to forge formal or informal coalitions, vertical or

---

[249] For a general introduction to the area of leadership studies including definitional concepts and a history of the evolution of leadership studies, see "History and Evolution of Leadership Studies" in "Leadership: A Library of Resources for Sustainable Entrepreneurs" prepared and distributed by the Sustainable Entrepreneurship Project (www.seproject.org).

[250] H.L. de Ver, Leadership, Politics and Development: A Literature Survey (Development Leadership Program, Background Paper, April 2008), www.dlprog.org/ftp/.../Leadership,%20Politics%20and%20Development.pdf, 4.

[251] H.L. de Ver, Conceptions of Leadership (Development Leadership Program, Background Paper, March 2009), www.dlprog.org/ftp/.../Conceptions%20of%20Leadership.pdf

horizontal, to solve collective action problems and that the influence of informal institutions is much greater in developing countries and it was thus imperative for leaders to understand those institutions and engage with them in order to be effective.

After conducting an extensive survey of the general literature on "leadership", de Ver concluded that relatively little work had been done on leadership in the specific context of developing countries and the unique problems that the social, economic and political environments in those countries create for their prospective leaders. Her specific findings included the following[252]:

- Leadership as concept and practice has neither been properly researched nor understood analytically as a key element in the politics of economic growth and social development and the available literature seldom addresses those key issues.
- The bulk of the literature focuses on individuals and individual capacities, or attributes (i.e., individual leaders' characteristics, qualities, attributes or traits), and not on leadership as a political process involving both leaders' relations with followers and, more critically, elites and coalitions and their interactions.
- Much of the general leadership literature has a distinctly Western, business-related focus with a particular emphasis on leadership from a managerial and organizational perspective. This is not surprising given that most of the scholars working in the field of "leadership studies"' are based in the US and many of the leading textbooks on the subject have generally included few case studies and examples set in the developing world while focusing most of the attention on Western management systems.
- Only a small body of "mainstream leadership literature" addresses the role of leadership for economic and social development and what is available is largely confined to empirical studies of individual cases.
- What literature there is on leadership in developing countries pays little attention to issues concerning leaders, elites and coalitions.
- There are substantial policy-relevant research gaps to be filled. For example, de Ver urges the research community to move toward creating and expanding a library of case studies that illustrate the role that leaders, elites and coalitions in developing countries have played in successfully achieving sustained economic growth, social development and organizational success. Cases studies should focus on national, sub-national, sectorial and organizational activities.

While de Ver's critiques are varied and diverse, she correctly points out the problems that arise when so much of the leadership-related research is based on an assumption of universal acceptance of Western business culture, which she describes as one "in which profit is the main indicator of success and the main goal"[253]. The following passage illustrates how and why application of a Western "cultural hegemomy" can lead to puzzling and problematic results in developing countries:

---

[252] H.L. de Ver, Leadership, Politics and Development: A Literature Survey (Development Leadership Program, Background Paper, April 2008), www.dlprog.org/ftp/.../Leadership,%20Politics%20and%20Development.pdf, 3-6.
[253] Id.

"[In the West there is] the belief that people are rational actors, that markets should be given predominance over the state, and that individualism and competition have inherent merits. In other cultures, however, these assumptions are not universally accepted and often the opposite is the case. For example . . . in much of East Asia emphasis is placed on conformity, notions of interpersonal harmony and collectivism or group-centeredness. This is in clear contrast to the Western functionalist paradigm where emphasis is placed on autonomy, competition between individuals and groups, performance and self-assertion. In Africa, a different culture of leadership, again, is visible, with emphasis on ceremony, ritual, interpersonal relations, reciprocity, and the distribution of scant resources to clan and ethnic affiliates over and above profit and competition."[254]

Another problem with relying on Western-based notions of organizational and managerial leadership for analyzing developing countries is the implicit assumption that the political environment and business systems are relatively stable. In fact, formal rules, regulations and accepted practices are often unavailable, or ignored, in developing countries. While the situation is slowly changing as developing countries engage in wholesale restructuring and strengthening of their institutions it is still generally the case that leaders in developing countries must operate in an environment in which rules change constantly and change is accepted slowly and often with great suspicion by followers. This is one of the reasons that a key role of an organizational leader in a developing country is protecting the organization against the possibility of adverse changes in policy by public institutions, since the state continues to exercise substantial influence in the marketplaces of developing countries.

As in all countries, leaders in developing countries act within a specific socio-cultural environment and the characteristics of that environment are presumed to be important determinants of the efficacy of the leader's style and practices. Aycan suggested a profile of the "typical" cultural environment in developing countries that included a strong emphasis on relationships and networking; a strong family orientation that impacts both the personal and work lives of society members; low individual performance orientation, consistent with the strong relationship orientation and collectivist nature of most developing country societies; a low sense of control and self-efficacy, leading to a feeling of "fatalism" and a sense that events are out of the control of society members; downward, indirect and non-confrontational communication patterns; and, finally, a strong authority orientation rooted in respect, loyalty and deference toward those in positions of authority.[255] She also cautioned, however, that there are certain to be significant cultural differences among the large number of countries still classified as "developing" and that within each country one will find differences among individuals—due to education, social-economic status or age; regional and ethic sub-cultures; and business organizations (e.g., subsidiaries of multinational corporations will likely have different cultural orientations than indigenous family-owned businesses).

---

[254] Id. at 16 (based on omitted quotes from, and citations to P. Blunt and M. Jones, "Exploring the limits of Western leadership theory in East Asia and Africa," Personnel Review, 26:1/2 (1997), 6-23).

[255] Z. Aycan, "Leadership and Teamwork in Developing Countries: Challenges and Opportunities" in W. Lonner, D. Dinnel, S. Hayes and D. Sattler (Eds.), Online Readings in Psychology and Culture, 2004, http://www.ac.wwu.edu/~culture/readings.htm.

Using societal culture as a reference point, Pasa et al. provided a suggested list of the expectations and assumptions of leaders in developing countries with respect to their followers along with a profile of leader preferences regarding their own styles and behaviour. Specifically, they argued that in developing countries leaders "are more likely to assume that their employees have an external locus of control, have limited and fixed potential, operate from a time perspective that is past and present oriented and have a short-time focus".[256] With respect to the actual behaviour of leaders in developing countries, Pasa et al. predicted that they "are more likely to encourage a passive or reactive stance to task performance, judge success on moralism derived from tradition and religion, favour an authoritarian or paternalistic orientation and accept that consideration of the context overrides principles and rules".[257] Jaeger observed that "[t]he relatively high power distance and the authoritarian/paternalistic people orientation of developing countries imply a certain type of leadership behaviour and leader-follower relationship . . . characterized as being more congruent with 'Theory X' leadership, which . . . presupposes limited and fixed human potential".

It is certainly problematic and dangerous to make generalizations regarding the elements of societal culture that can be found in the large swath of countries around the world that are classified as "developing". However, cultural profiles developed by researchers may be used as a means for creating hypotheses about the issues and problems that will likely confront leaders in developing countries and the solutions that might be used in order to motivate followers to act in ways that contribute to the achievement of goals established for the organization. In addition, understanding the cultural profile of the country in which a leader is operating provides a clue regarding the preferred personality traits and work values of leaders; the manner in which leaders should seek to relate to their subordinates, including the degree to which leaders are expected to be involved in the personal affairs of subordinates and their families; the basis upon which a leader can attained "legitimacy" in the eyes of those that he or she is seeking to leader; and, finally, the effectiveness of particular leadership styles and behaviours.[258]

§6:2   Relationship orientation and paternalism

The strong relationship orientation found in many developing countries explains the popularity and prevalence of the paternalistic leadership style in developing countries. Leaders, like others in those countries, place great importance on establishing and maintaining interpersonal relationships with others including subordinates in the

---

[256] S. Pasa, H. Kabasakal and M. Bodur, "Society, Organisations and Leadership in Turkey", Applied Psychology: An International Review, 50(4) (2001), 559-589, 563 (citing R. Kanungo and A. Jaeger, "Introduction: The need for indigenous management in developing countries" in A. Jaeger and R. Kanungo (Eds.), Management in developing countries (London: Routledge, 1990)).
[257] Id. at 563.
[258] A. Jaeger, "The applicability of Western management techniques in developing countries: a cultural perspective" in A. Jaeger and R. Kanungo, Management in Developing Countries (London: Routledge, 1990), 131-145-263, 139. For further discussion of "Theory X" leadership, see "Human Resources: A Library of Resources for Sustainable Entrepreneurs" prepared and distributed by the Sustainable Entrepreneurship Project (www.seproject.org).

workplace. In turn, subordinates also expect a relationship with their superior that is personal yet professional and characterized by protection, close guidance and supervision. In exchange for the responsibilities that leaders take for their lives, subordinates are loyal and deferential to their leaders and are generally willing to follow their directions without question or criticism. The paternalistic relationship between leaders and subordinates in developing countries is analogous to a parent-child relationship and, as is the case in the familial context, the relationship is hierarchical with the leader assumed to "know better" for the subordinates in all areas of their lives: personal, professional and family-related matters.[259]

Aycan argues that the evidence of paternalism can be found in numerous acts by both leaders and subordinates within and outside the workplace. For example, Aycan explains that "[t]he paternalistic leader gives advice (often times unsolicited) and guides employees in personal, professional (e.g., make career planning on their behalf), and family-related matters (e.g., do marriage counseling, resolve disputes between husband and wives, etc.); shows concern for the well-being of the subordinate as well as his/her family; attends congratulatory (e.g., weddings) and condolence (e.g., funerals) ceremonies of employees as well as their immediate family members; when in need, provides financial assistance to employees (in form of donations or sometimes as loans) in, for example, housing, health-care, and educational expenses of their children; allows them to attend personal or family-related problems by letting them leave early or take a day off; acts as a mediator in interpersonal conflicts among employees, and even talks to the disputed party on behalf of the other (without his knowledge or consent) to resolve the conflict".[260] In return, subordinates are willing to go to great lengths to demonstrate their loyalty and deference to their leaders including "engaging in extra-role behavior or working overtime (unpaid) upon the request of the supervisor; not quitting the job (even if one receives a much better job offer) because of loyalty; following the paternalistic superior to another organization if s/he quits the company; not questioning nor disagreeing with the superior in decisions regarding the company or the employee (e.g., performance evaluations, career-planning, etc.); doing personal favors for the superior when needed (e.g., helping him during the construction of his house); putting extra effort in the job and working hard, so not to lose face to the superior".[261]

§6:3   Family orientation

Family orientation is an important influence on societal culture in developing countries and plays an important part in how subordinates view work activities in the larger context of their lives and how subordinates expect their leaders to act in an organizational context. In most cases, subordinates view work primarily as a means for satisfying the needs of their families and advancing the family's status within society. In addition, subordinates expect that the organizations they work for will take care of them and their

---

[259] Z. Aycan, "Leadership and Teamwork in Developing Countries: Challenges and Opportunities" in W. Lonner, D. Dinnel, S. Hayes and D. Sattler (Eds.), Online Readings in Psychology and Culture, 2004, http://www.ac.wwu.edu/~culture/readings.htm.

[260] Id.

[261] Id.

families and it is common to find organizations offering health and educational services to their workers and their families, contributing to housing and heating expenses and providing financial assistance to workers who may be experiencing problems. Family obligations are routinely allowed to take precedence over work. Aycan explained that "employees feel entitled to absent themselves from work for family-related reasons . . . [w]ork always comes next to gamily, and there is nothing more natural than this".[262] Family orientation is also expressed through the preference for subordinate-superior relationships in the workplace that are analogous to the way that a parent (i.e., the superior) interacts with a child (i.e., the subordinate) and vice versa.

§6:4 Harmony and individual performance orientation

One of the most vexing issues for leaders steeped in Anglo-style values and practices is establishing reward systems in developing countries that are intended to motivate subordinates to establish and pursue individual goals and objectives. The importance placed on maintaining good and harmonious interpersonal relationships tends to stifle individual performance orientation in developing countries. Subordinates are expected to concentrate on loyalty and compliance toward their superiors and acting in ways that promote, rather than disturb, harmony with their co-workers. This means that any action that causes a person to "stand out" within his or her group is frowned upon and may lead to jealousy and isolation of that person. In turn, persons who are having trouble fulfilling their quotas or otherwise keeping up with others will usually be tolerated and treated with compassion as long as they are doing their best and have an honest intention to contribute to the work of the group.[263] Muczyk and Holt noted that in light of the collectivist nature of many societies classified as "developing" it is not surprising that group and/or organizational measures of performance are recommended as the basis for rewards.[264]

§6:5 Low sense of control and self-efficacy

The low levels of sense of control and self-efficacy often found in developing countries causes persons to believe that events are based primarily on external causes outside of their control or influence. As a result, many people in developing countries look at activities such as planning, scheduling and goal setting as being pointless. They are also reluctant to be proactive and take initiative since they feel that there is little likelihood that such an approach will make a difference, given that results are out of their control, and there are concerns that individual initiative will simply increase risks and uncertainty and that challenging the status quo will disrupt harmony within the group. Poor or mediocre behaviour may be explained, and tolerated, in developing countries as simply being a person's "destiny".

§6:6 Communication patterns

---

[262] Id.

[263] For further discussion, see H. Kabasakal and A. Dastmalchian, "Leadership and culture in the Middle East", Applied Psychology: An International Review, 50(4) (2001), 559-589.

[264] J. Muczyk and D. Holt, "Toward a Cultural Contingency Model of Leadership", Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 14(4) (May 2008), 277-286, 283.

Aycan noted that organizational communication patterns in developing countries tend to be "indirect, non-assertive, non-confrontational, and usually downwards"[265], which is consistent with the hierarchical nature of organizations and the acceptance of authority from and at the top of the hierarchy. This has a number of consequences for organizational leaders in developing countries. First, honest and complete performance evaluations are extremely difficult since negative feedback, even when intended to improve performance, is seen as when Aycan described as "destructive criticism" and often misconstrued as being a personal attack on the recipient. Feedback, when given, must also be presented in a way that does not cause the recipient to lose "face" among his or her peers and in the eyes of his or her superiors. Finally, negative feedback may be viewed as disrupting the all-important sense of harmony within the group. Second, downward communication patterns mean that little, if any, feedback flows from subordinates up to their superiors. This is not surprising given the deference shown to those in positions of authority; however, the lack of information from lower levels of the organization may undermine the leader's ability to make appropriate decisions and make adjustments to directions that have already been issued. Aycan also noted that "[t]here is strong preference for face-to-face communication in business dealings" in developing countries.[266] While this type of communication should, presumably, reduce the risk of misunderstanding it also tends to be more time-consuming and may lead to delays in completing specific tasks and entire projects.

§6:7   Leader authority and power

The almost absolute authority of superiors in an organizational context in developing countries is consistent with the authority orientation that permeates societal culture in those countries. Superiors are entitled to, and receive, respect, loyalty and deference and are trusted because of their knowledge, experience and achievements. While organizational rules may be prescribed, subordinates act based on their respect for authority rather than because they are expected to follow rules and procedures. Subordinates rarely challenge those in authority and accept that while superiors are part of the "in-group" they have a higher status that separates them from other group members and entitles them to certain privileges and advantages. Superiors in developing countries often have close relationships with their subordinates, including close and extensive participation in the personal lives of subordinates; however, these relationships are not to be confused with "friendship" and typically remain formal and distant.

The respect for, and acceptance of, a leader's authority in developing countries is accompanied by a strong desire among leaders to exercise the power they have been given over their subordinates and their firms. Ideally, at least from the perspective of the subordinates, power will be exercise in a manner that is consistent with good interpersonal relations between leaders and their subordinates—a style that Aycan

---

[265] Z. Aycan, "Leadership and Teamwork in Developing Countries: Challenges and Opportunities" in W. Lonner, D. Dinnel, S. Hayes and D. Sattler (Eds.), Online Readings in Psychology and Culture, 2004, http://www.ac.wwu.edu/~culture/readings.htm.
[266] Id.

describes as "benevolent paternalism"[267], which is characterized by a leader exercising his or her power for the benefit of subordinates in the same way that a parent directs and disciplines his or her children for "their own good". Often, however, leaders in developing countries engage in what Aycan called "exploitative paternalism" and use their power and status for their personal benefit and the advantage of their families and other in-group members.[268] Even when leaders engage in benevolent paternalism they still insist in various manifestations of their power and authority such as formality and respect in personal relationships with subordinates. In addition, the inequality of power between leaders and subordinates leads to centralization and unilateral decision making by the leader. Consultation with subordinates is rare, even non-existent, since leaders believe that encouraging participation in decision making by subordinates will undermine their power and make them look weak. For their part, subordinates in developing countries are generally tolerant of apparently dictatorial practices of their leaders with respect to decisions and instructions because they trust the wisdom and competencies of the leader and are themselves reluctant to take on the risks and responsibilities that come with making decisions.

§6:8   Leader networking responsibilities

The importance of relationships between leaders and their subordinates in developing countries has already been discussed above; however, the relationship orientation typically found in those countries extends outside of the workplace in the form of the extensive efforts that leaders in developing countries must make in order to establish and maintain good relations with those in positions of power within key institutions such as the government. The scarcity of technical and financial resources in developing countries, and the role that local politics plays in who controls those resources and how they are allocated, means that organizational leaders in those countries must proactively seek to protect the interests of their firms. Accordingly, Aycan notes that developing countries leaders must be skilled in "networking and diplomacy".[269]

---

[267] Id.
[268] Id.
[269] Id.