



Leadership and Culture: What Difference Does it Make?

Michelle G. Segundo
Regent University
Roundtable: Global Consulting

Culture is a complex, multilevel, and multidimensional phenomenon consisting of visible and invisible traits that directly and indirectly influence people and behavior (Aymin & Korabik, 2010). As culture is embedded into the way people think and live, it also significantly influences leaders who in turn influence employees and organizations as a whole. Leaders attempting to conduct business on a global level and lead teams cross-culturally, must not only have an understanding of diverse cultures but must also appreciate core cultural values to lead effectively. Hofstede's (1980b) four dimensions of cross-cultural leadership: (a) power distance; (b) masculinity; (c) individualism; and (d) uncertainty avoidance contributed to House's (1993) twenty-year, cross-cultural GLOBE research project asserting that certain leadership styles such as transformational, servant, and autocratic were optimal leadership methods in certain cultures. The purpose of this paper is to explain how culture affects leadership and how certain leadership theories (transformational, servant, and autocratic) are applicable to certain cultures (Latin American, Confucian Asian, and Anglo) based on their dimensional scores.

Keywords: transformational leadership, servant leadership, autocratic leadership, cross-cultural leadership

Culture is a set of beliefs, norms, values, traditions, and behavior patterns that a group shares or holds in common and has a significant effect on leadership because it is a programming of the mind that determines the identity of a group in the same manner personality determines the identity of an individual (Schein, 1985; Hofstede, 1980a; 1992). Culture shapes the values and attitudes that affect people's perceptions and is intertwined with leadership processes within organizations (Ayman, Mead, Bassari, & Huang, 2012; Dorfman, 1996). As organizational leaders attempt to conduct business cross-culturally, they are faced with the dilemma of trying to adapt to the local culture or try to change it (Hofstede, 1980b); however, Konopaske (2018) has asserted that "the era of domestically bound approaches to managing what occurs in organizations is ending" (p. 34) because the workplace is becoming more culturally diverse while

organizations attempt to do business globally, and no leader is free of ethnocentric tendencies considering culture's powerful influence. Organizations and global leaders expecting to survive the current globalization phenomena must learn to interact with people of other cultures if they expect to positively affect others around the world (Dorfman, 1996; Moodian, 2008). The focus of this research is on cultural behaviors as noted by Hofstede's (1980b) cross-cultural dimensions that coincide with the transformational, servant, and autocratic leadership theories that have proven to be effective or ineffective when compared and contrasted to Latin American, Confucian Asian, and Anglo cultures.

Cross-Cultural Leadership Dimensions

Hofstede (1984) posited that "people build organizations according to their values, and societies are composed of institutions and organizations that reflect the dominant values within their culture" (p. 81); furthermore, leadership "within a society is very much constrained by its cultural context, because it is impossible to coordinate the actions of people without a deep understanding of their values, beliefs, and expressions" (p. 82).

To understand how cultures differ empirically, Hofstede (1980b) characterized four dimensions that serve as a framework for diverse cultural behavior and values: (a) power distance; (b) uncertainty avoidance; (c) individualism; and (d) masculinity. Each dimension is interdependent and complex and cannot always be generalized across cultures; rather, "a leader in a specific national culture may need to apply various attitudes and behaviors to exercise the right blend of influence to accomplish relevant goal achievement" (Konopaske, 2018, p. 426).

Power Distance

The first cultural dimension of power distance refers to the power gap that exists between less powerful, societal members and those who exhibit higher levels of power or influence such as those in positions of leadership in institutions, organizations, and government. Lesser powerful societal members acknowledge the gap and are comfortable with the power inequality.

Low power distance. Low power distance societies exhibit minimal inequality, the way to change is to redistribute power, superiors are accessible, all should have equal rights, the system is to blame, and harmony exists between the powerful and powerless.

High power distance. High power distance societies exhibit distrust among others as they are seen to be a threat to personal power, superiors are inaccessible, power-holders are entitled to privileges, inequality has an order and everyone has a high or low place, the way to change is to dethrone those in power, conflict exists between the powerful and powerless, and the underdog is to blame (Hofstede, 1980b).

Uncertainty Avoidance

The second cultural dimension of uncertainty avoidance refers to society members being intolerant of uncertainty or ambiguity and attempt to control unstable situations by establishing formal laws and rules, frowning upon deviant behaviors, providing stable career options, belief in absolute truths, and the attainment of expertise (Hofstede, 1980b).

Strong uncertainty avoidance. Strong uncertainty avoidance societies have higher levels of anxiety and aggressive behaviors that create an inner need in societal members to work hard, avoid risk, and adhere to rigid laws, rules, and procedures, heightened nationalism and emotion, strong need for consensus, and ordinary citizens are incompetent compared to authorities.

Weak uncertainty avoidance. Weak uncertainty avoidance societies have less formal laws and rules, less emotion is shown, less stress, high tolerance for deviation, aggressive behavior is unacceptable, minimized nationalism, risk taking behaviors, hard work is not a virtue, and authorities serve the citizens.

Individualism

The third cultural dimension of individualism refers to the notion that people are expected to take care of themselves and immediate families only and have a loose social network where the concern is only for the individual's goals, needs, and initiative, everyone has the right to a private life, and value standards should apply to all.

Collectivism. Collective societies in direct contrast to individualistic societies refer to groups that are tightly knit where individuals act in the best interest of the group as a whole expecting the group to look after them and commit their loyalty to the group, clan, or organization in return. Collective societies emphasize belonging to a group, individuals depend on the organization or clan for stability and emotionally, value standards are contingent from group to group, and one's private life is invaded by the clan where opinions are predetermined by leadership.

Masculinity

The fourth dimension of masculinity in societies is characterized by assertiveness, the acquisition of money and material items, uncaring of others and the quality of life, sex roles are clearly different, live to work, performance and ambition are key, ostentatious manliness or machismo are valued where men are expected to be assertive and women nurturing.

Femininity

Feminine societies in direct contrast to masculine societies are characterized by fluid sex roles, sex equality, service to others and quality of life are key, sympathizes with the less fortunate, interdependence is ideal, and men are not expected to be assertive but can also assume nurturing qualities.

Hofstede's (1980b) cultural dimensions lay the framework for understanding how countries respond to various leadership styles based on their cultural conditioning. While a particular leadership method may be effective in one culture, it may be ineffective in another, which is the reason for a thorough explanation of each cultural dimension and how the transformational, servant, and autocratic leadership theories correlate with Latin American, Confucian Asian, and Anglo cultures.

Transformational Leadership Theory

Burns (1978) introduced the transformational leadership theory in direct contrast to transactional leadership calling for leaders to progress from an extrinsic reward for performance exchange to satisfy followers intrinsically while sharing an inspired vision to accomplish shared goals. Avolio and Bass (1995) contributed to Burns' (1978) transformational leadership theory by noting four characteristics known as the four I's of transformational leadership:

1. **Idealistic:** the leadership acts with high ideals causing followers to want to identify with their leaders and emulate them;
2. **Inspirational:** the leadership inspires the followers to work toward a shared goal and vision providing followers with meaning and purpose;
3. **Intellectually Stimulating:** the leadership is intellectually stimulates followers challenging them to be creative, submit new ideas, and helps followers solve problems unconventionally; and
4. **Individually Concerned:** the leadership considers each individual of a group focusing on personally supporting, mentoring, and coaching followers (Avolio & Bass, 2002).

Bass (1995) has suggested that transformational leaders exhibiting high levels of the four I's of leadership can "move followers to exceed expectations - to generate extra effort, creativity, and productivity" (p. 468). Transformational leaders build relationships through intentional and inspirational communication and can shift an organization's culture that will motivate, inspire, and cast a community-oriented vision addressing "each follower's sense of self-worth in order to engage the follower in true commitment and involvement in the effort at hand, broadening and enlarging...the interests of those whom they lead" and motivating their followers to go above expected performance overlooking their own self-interests for the benefit of the group, society, or organization as a whole (Avolio & Bass, 2002). Based on a country's dimensional scores,

the transformational leadership style may be ideal whereas leaders attempting to incorporate transformational leadership methods will prove ineffective in cultures who do not value collaboration, inspiration, individual consideration, or intellectual stimulation.

Latin American Culture

The Latin American cluster in the GLOBE research project consist of Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Mexico, and Venezuela. With Latin Americans' high value of collectivism over individualism, Latin Americans are likely to be more accepting of the transformational leadership style only if they know their families and community will benefit because "collectivism in Latin America is associated with family rather than work groups" (Romero, 2004, p. 27) because transformational leadership encompasses the notion of a group working together toward a shared goal for the benefit of the group or organization rather than the individual. Although Latin Americans are unlikely to take risks due to their high uncertainty avoidance, Latin Americans are encouraged to initiate family and group businesses where ambiguity is lessened ensuring familiar and trustworthy people are partnered with the business reinforcing Latin Americans' collective loyalties (Romero, 2004).

Mexican leaders' satisfaction positively correlates with group and individual performance exhibiting a sense of value in workplace relationships (Chemers & Ayman, 1985) where low conflict exists among Latin leaders and subordinates; however, Latin leaders attempting to incorporate transformational leadership qualities such as soliciting input from subordinates may be viewed as a weak and a poor manager because of the high power distance culture; therefore, communication is more of a top-down, hierarchical method keeping the distance between leadership and subordinates directly contrasting with transformational leadership qualities of collaboration (Romero, 2004) considering the transformational leader treats each follower as an individual, provides coaching, mentoring and growth opportunities to develop their followers into leaders (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999).

Confucian Asia Culture

The Confucian Asia cluster in the GLOBE research project include the countries of China, Hong Kong, Japan, Singapore, South Korea, and Taiwan. With Confucian Asian values of high collectivism and midrange dimensional scores of power distance, gender egalitarianism, and uncertainty avoidance, Confucian Asians are a charismatic, value-based, team-oriented culture placing great value on participative leadership where delegation and empowerment are qualities that bridge the power distance and hierarchical behavior approaches to leadership" (Fu, Wu, & Yang, 2007; Yukl, 2013); therefore, the transformational leadership style would be mostly effective considering the high sense of structured relationships and inner compass of mutual respect. Fu et al.

(2007) has noted that a survey of Chinese citizens showed 92% place great value on guanxi or relationships and 72% prefer guanxi connections over bureaucratic relationships to accomplish personal goals (Yeung & Tung, 1996). The Chinese showed high scores of team orientation and team integration placing a high value on collaboration and collectivism in the workplace (Fu & Tsui, 2003).

Despite Communist rule and influence, the most valued leadership qualities in the Confucian Asian culture are (a) hard working, (b) visionary, (c) aggressive, (d) knowledgeable, (e) eager to learn, (f) problem solving, and (g) change-oriented (Fu & Tsui, 2003) that sets a high standard for vision, confidence and emulation coincide with transformational leadership qualities where a leader works alongside his followers providing a shared vision inspiring subordinates to work for the best interest of the group or organization as a whole bringing organizational and cultural change through ideal behavioral traits that inspire, motivate, and cast group/ community-oriented vision (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999). Transformational leadership seems to be an ideal leadership method for the Confucian Asian culture as Confucian-rooted leaders are expected to

be modest and prudent, restrain themselves from any presumption and any precipitation, be capable of practicing self-criticism and have the courage to correct inadequacies and errors in their work. In any case, they should not hide their errors, take all the credit for themselves and lay all the blame on others. (Bouc, 1977).

Fu et al. (2007) conducted focus group interviews in Shanghai in 1997 to explore the desired leadership traits and behaviors that leaders value, and it appears the most desired traits despite Communist rule reflect transformational leadership values as noted below:

1. A good leader knows how to balance between being conservative and aggressive;
2. A good leader must have a vision and must be able to look far ahead;
3. A good leader must be open to new ideas and constantly try to improve himself;
4. A good leader must initiate change and be determined to carry out the change;
5. A good leader must be humane;
6. A good leader knows what works for the Chinese while learning from the West.

Anglo Culture

The Anglo cluster in the GLOBE research project include the countries of Australia, Canada (English speaking), England, Ireland, New Zealand, South Africa (White sample), and the United States were former british colonies. Countries in the Anglo cluster generally scored low to medium in the power distance index, low to medium on the uncertainty avoidance dimension, and scored higher in individualism and

masculinity dimensions. Of all the clusters in Hofstede's (1980) GLOBE project countries, the Anglo countries scored highest in charismatic value-based leadership qualities endorsing team orientation and participative leadership showing how leaders are expected to achieve success by means of teamwork; however, the methods in which a leader is to achieve success through a group varies throughout the individual Anglo countries (Chhokar, 2007). The English prefer leadership that is informed but also consultative who receive input from followers as opposed to the autocratic type leader who does not involve subordinates in decision making. The Irish prefer an idealistic leader who displays integrity, loyalty, and makes decisions conceptually yet is careful to maintain a low power distance and remain humble (Chhokar, 2007) consistent with transformational leadership attributes where the leader maintains his status but does not flaunt his power or position. Stewart (2006) asserted that transformational leadership encompasses virtues that benefit not only the leader but subordinates as well that coincides with Americans' preference of an ideal leader revered as a hero who promotes team spirit and expresses care and concern for subordinates (Chhokar, 2007). While Australian leaders are expected to achieve success, uphold moral ideals, and consider their followers, they are expected to remain humble when compared to their American counterparts who are highly ambitious and charismatic flaunting their achievements and individualism (Ashkanasy, 2007). English culture has evolved from high power distance, autocratic rule to a democracy where the liberal culture promotes individual power rather than state power and exhibit self reliance where the younger, more educated generation embraces liberalism, questions leadership assumptions and are encouraged to generate creative solutions to problems as opposed to the less educated, elderly English population who prefer the autocratic form of leadership with strict laws and out of reach leadership (Booth, 2007; Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999).

The United States consistently measures with the Anglo cluster exhibiting high levels of individualism, masculinity, and lower to moderate levels of power distance and uncertainty avoidance. With Americans being highly individualistic, self-sufficient, individually goal-oriented, and expecting to be fully informed with leadership's decisions and actions, the transformational leadership style is ideal for Americans allowing subordinates to collaborate with leadership in decision making, attain personal achievement, and work together toward a common goal although Americans expect a reward in return for their efforts. As charismatic attributes are often correlated with transformational leadership, House (2004) described the following desired American leadership attributes: (a) career, (b) performance, (c) results, (d) challenge, (e) competition, (f) execution, (g) "going the extra mile," (h) decisiveness, and (i) efficiency. Solid relationships are also encouraged; however, those relationships are a mere means to an end for personal achievement rather than an initial collective benefit despite a true transformational leader being committed to treating people as ends not as mere means (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999). The final leadership traits desired by Americans in the Anglo cluster fully encompass the charismatic, transformational leadership style consisting of the following characteristics because transformational leaders challenge the process

giving the impression that they are dynamic and competent providing subordinates with meaning and challenging them to undertake the tasks needed to accomplish shared goals (Kouzes and Posner, 2002):

1. Have a vision and stick with it;
 2. Be charismatic, inspirational, optimistic, and hope for success, appeal to the good in people, care about them and serve the greater good;
 3. Be a catalyst, turn things around, and create something new;
 4. Implement, be efficient, overcome all odds, and persevere;
 5. Be true to self and own conviction, have integrity and honesty, be straightforward, lead by example;
 6. Be exceptional, unconventional, have a good track record, and be a winner.
- (Hoppe & Bhagat, 2007)

Servant Leadership Theory

The servant leadership theory developed by Greenleaf (1977) focuses its leadership style on leaders being driven by a desire to serve followers and helping followers maximize their potential without expecting anything in return. Servant leaders place followers' needs above their own, nurture, defend, listen, learn their followers' aspirations, share in their pain, and empower followers rather than use their own power to dominate over their followers (Yukl, 2013). Servant leaders stand for social justice and equality respecting weak and marginalized members, stand for what is right even when it is not in the best financial interest of the organization, and ensure fairness and equality among subordinates influencing others to also become servant leaders creating an employee-oriented culture that attracts and retains talented, committed employees (Yukl, 2013).

Latin American Culture

It is unlikely that servant leadership would be very effective in Latin American culture due to its high levels of power distance and uncertainty avoidance. The servant leader places followers' needs above his own and empowers followers instead of using power to dominate his followers. Latin Americans are comfortable with the power distance between themselves and their leadership and take comfort in praising their leadership as well as blaming their leadership which would not be possible under servant leadership constructs. Servant leadership is also likely to be ineffective in Latin cultures because rather than leadership collaborating with subordinates in a participative style, Latin American subordinates depend on higher levels of leadership in an organization for guidance in decision making where punishment is used more often than rewards (Romero, 2004). With the Latin leader being directive and independently decisive, participative leadership is ineffective as well as practices such as employee involvement, open communication, employee ownership, and egalitarianism are not only ineffective but are undesirable in Latin countries which is in direct contrast to servant leadership constructs (Schuler, Jackson, & Jackofsky, 1996).

Confucian Asian Culture

Confucius advocated for self control urging Asians to control their emotions and desires that could lead them astray from strictly obeying superiors. Obedience is at the root of paternalistic leadership rooted in Asian culture making servant leadership an ineffective leadership method for this cluster (Chhokar, 2007). One of the Confucian virtues placing a high value on kindness, benevolence, and respecting others' feelings allows for servant leadership to be an effective leadership style as servant leaders take into consideration their followers' needs and places their followers above themselves. Although a hierarchical structure exists, a mutual respect and internal moral compass serves as a guide to avoid shame and honoring others, making good, moral choices, and upholding a sense of kindness and righteousness (Fu et al., 2007). With the paternalistic culture, Confucian Asian employees feel as if their place of employment is a large family and their leader provides security as a father does as the head of the family. Because Communist party members and leadership are expected to be introspective, make personal adjustments in personal character flaws, serve as role models to subordinates, and serve their subordinates whole-heartedly, servant leadership as a construct would be effective to an extent as servant leaders are encouraged to produce other leaders as servants, place their followers' needs above their own, and serve their followers while participating in their joy and pain.

Anglo Culture

United States displayed maximum scores in individualism calling for every act to be explained in terms of self-interest because Americans are more willing to take risks, are less trusting of superiors, and expect to obtain satisfaction in return for their actions contradicting the very foundation of servant leadership where leaders place their followers needs above their own, are self-sacrificing, and have strong relationships with subordinates (Hofstede, 1980b). Unlike the Confucian Asian culture who instruct their children of filial loyalty where the pursuit of individual interests is discouraged, Anglo culture embraces individualism where members act in their own best interest moving away from home and family as soon as they are able in pursuit of their own goals. Australian leaders are expected to be equal to subordinates as well as egalitarian (Chhokar, 2007).

Considering the Anglo culture's midrange dimensional scores of power distance and uncertainty avoidance, Anglo cultures most effective leadership style is transformational leadership where leaders receive input from followers, collaborate, inspire, and cast a shared vision to work toward as a whole while pursuing individualistic goals and fulfilling individualistic needs for success. In Australia for example, leaders are to reach for success but not stand out too far above subordinates yet are expected not to be too self-sacrificing that does not completely encapsulate servant leadership.

Autocratic Leadership Theory

Autocratic leadership as initially presented by Lewin and Lippitt (1938) focuses on power and authority belonging exclusively to the leader where the leader does not rely on input from followers and is the sole decision maker, is impersonal and maintains distance from followers, gives short term goals to keep overall vision ambiguous to maintain control over subordinates and tasks, rewards and punishes, is not concerned with employee development or empowerment, and establish formal rules and policies.

Latin American Culture

Due to Latin American countries' high uncertainty avoidance, power distance, and masculinity, Latin Americans are traditionally more likely to respond positively to the autocratic, paternalistic leadership style because they are more comfortable with a clear distinction between leaders and subordinates where power is distributed unequally (Konopaske, Ivancevich, & Matteson, 2018). Latin America's high power distance and masculinity allows for a concentration of power and elitism where leaders are direct and authoritative, unapproachable, do not communicate with subordinates, delegate rather than collaborate, and are less likely to use teams in the workplace calling for the autocratic leadership style as its ideal form of leadership (Romero, 2004). Romero (2004) noted the following six characteristics that describe the traditional Latin American leader prototype that coincide with autocratic leadership traits that Latin Americans seek in their leaders:

1. Autocratic and directive;
2. Seldom delegates work;
3. Seldom uses teams;
4. Formal top-down communication;
5. Avoids conflict and relationship oriented;
6. Assertive and aggressive.

Latin Americans are likely to search for the above type qualities when deeming who qualifies as a leader and who does not. Latin Americans not only expect their leaders to exhibit the above autocratic-type traits, but they also naturally gravitate toward people exhibiting these traits as the high power distance between leader and follower provides subordinates with a sense of security in the elite leader (Romero, 2004).

Confucian Asian Culture

With Confucian ideology emphasizing learning through a hierarchical and family-modeled institution and principles such as diligence, self-sacrifice, and delayed gratification, the autocratic leadership style would not be optimal considering autocratic leaders are distant, informal, and mission-driven rather than people-driven. Doctrine of the mean avoiding extremes that create social disorder. Wisdom comes with

old age, Confucian Asian elders are revered, given absolute authority, and are established at the top of the societal, hierarchical structure requiring strict obedience from family members. Chinese culture acknowledges males as being born into leadership positions referred to as a headship to connect them to the collective, familial role where the born leader is expected to be righteous and display virtuous qualities as opposed to western or Anglo culture where a person exhibits leadership type qualities before being recognized as an individualistic leader (Chhokar, 2007). Ancient Chinese culture viewed the country as a large family where the eldest male held the greatest authority and countrymen were considered as children who were expected to submit and obey the leader of the family or emperor allowing for autocratic leadership traits of high power distance and high uncertainty avoidance as ideal characteristics of effective leadership in this cluster (Chhokar, 2007).

Although this cluster operates collectively within families and organizations, holding males as natural born, paternalistic leaders who are expected to uphold Confucian virtues and ideals with extreme high power distance scores displays an autocratic leadership style but not fully an effective form of leadership as Western culture has begun to influence culture where Asians now have employment options rather than government-assigned jobs striving for equalized power and self-gain. Considering the Chinese Communist Party adopted a state socialist form of conducting business in 1949 where collective ownership and identity are emphasized representing the interest of the working class as a collective, there is no room for questioning of authority or doing tasks creatively or innovatively since the government regulates the quotas setting up the leadership as autocrats in theory but transformative partners practically.

Anglo Culture

New Zealand is the only country represented in the Anglo culture that prefers strong, autocratic type leaders as opposed to a sensitive leader although the white population of South Africans prefer strong, direct, firm leadership that is fair. Traditional English leadership methods expected leaders to act authoritatively, displaying a high power distance and in-egalitarianism that was predominantly masculine, individualistic, high achieving and stiff upper-lipped proper etiquette clearly dividing the upper and middle class from lower class citizens (Booth, 2007). Under traditional culture, England thrived under an autocratic style of leadership, but English culture has evolved into a democratic country yet citizens maintain high respect for the monarchy and its strict sense of hierarchical structure. American culture being one of collaboration, empowerment, achievement, flexibility, and creativity would not thrive under autocratic rule as Americans feel their leadership works on their behalf where subordinates are entitled to give their input or opinion in law making and leadership decisions.

Discussion

As organizations are faced with the pressure of globalization, cross-cultural dynamics can no longer be ignored or viewed as a liability (Moodian, 2008). Organizations must form conscious strategies based on the insight of a culture and embrace acculturated locals for their input and making necessary adjustments to current strategies to lead effectively (Hofstede, 1980a). Moodian (2008) has suggested that “the optimal management of a diverse workforce is achieved through an intercultural approach” (p. 4).

Confucian Asian leaders are no longer considered as heads of the family; however, leaders are still expected to take care of subordinates as if children in modern organizational settings due to the continuing paternalistic culture (Fu et al., 2007). Confucian Asian culture exhibits high collectivism treating others as they would like to be treated expecting leaders to exhibit self control while helping others in need to save *mianzi*, or face, in the community. Preserving one’s own reputation is a matter of preserving another’s reputation as well. A culture with high collective values would ideally thrive under the servant leadership model as leaders place others’ needs above their own and act as a servant to subordinates although Western culture is threatening collective values with its individualistic, egalitarian values. Traditional values are still highly respected in the Confucian Asian culture, but leaders find themselves struggling with tradition as they feel the pull to conform to challenge the norms and move toward competitiveness and modern Western ideologies despite Confucianist influence (Fu et al., 2007). Despite strong power distance, hierarchical, Communist, autocratic structure in the Confucian, Asian cluster, the servant leadership style seems most effective as a result of Confucian influence.

While Latin Americans are highly collective and value the group over individual achievement, the power distance and uncertainty avoidance dictate the leadership structure calling for the autocratic leadership style to be most effective. The GLOBE research project showed the Latin country clusters all exhibited high masculine qualities where toughness, assertiveness, and direct, confrontational leadership style is preferred; otherwise, feminine qualities of empathy, intuition, compassion, and humility are seen as weak and ineffective (Yukl, 2013). In some instances in more modern organizations with younger employees, transformational leadership has had an influence where subordinates are inspired to be creative and collaborative; however, the overall leadership qualities most desired in Latin America coincide with autocratic leadership.

The Anglo cluster overall prefer a transformational leadership style where subordinates are empowered, inspired, challenged, and exhibit high masculine traits of aggressiveness and assertiveness. The spread of strong individualistic achievement traits within the Anglo cluster can be attributed to immigration and colonization (Ronen, 1985).

Conclusion

Culture is learned in a society and is ingrained into every facet of a person's life including leaders and their values (Kim & Kim, 2010). In today's global environment, leaders must recognize their own cultural biases and adapt their styles to fit the culture and motivational needs of subordinates possibly utilizing more than one leadership style at the same time if needed to be effective (Northouse, 2018). Fry (2003) has asserted that "effective leaders are those individuals who are able to understand and tap into the needs and motives of followers to simultaneously reach leader and follower goals" (p. 701) just as the apostle Paul did as he admits he made himself a servant of all declaring "I have become all things to all people, that by all means I might save some" (1 Corinthians 9:22 English Standard Version). Global leaders are open and flexible, confident in approaching others, can cope with people from diverse backgrounds, and are willing to examine his or her own biases and perceptions to be interculturally competent in their skills, behavior, and values recognizing that today's global climate is a blend of cultures, religions, ethnicities, and lifestyles (Harris, Moran, and Moran, 2004).

GLOBE's twenty-year cross-cultural research project affirmed the five most desired leadership traits include: (a) integrity, (b) performance-oriented, (c) visionary, (d) inspirational, and (e) team-integrator (Dorfman, 2012, p. 507). Yukl (2013) has asserted that the evidence supports the conclusion that some form of transformational leadership is relevant in most if not all situations in any culture, but warns that "universal relevance does not mean that transformational leadership is equally effective in all situations" (p. 324) causing global leaders to consider each culture and its specific needs and motivations because organizations will only be able to operate when employees share the same values and are working toward the same goals (Konopaske, 2017). Although it is unnecessary to treat all subordinates the same, each person should be valued and respected as a team member rather than a second class citizen due to cultural differences (Yukl, 2013).

About the Author

Michelle Gonzalez Segundo is a third year Ph.D. student at Regent University, School of Business and Leadership, majoring in Organizational Leadership with a concentration in Ecclesial Leadership. Michelle's passion is people. Whether she's discipling others to realize their identity in Christ, calling, or leadership potential or serving the marginalized, she takes a "hands-on, boots-on-the ground" approach to leading teams in engaging the community and connecting resources for sharing the gospel particularly with the poor and homeless, disaster relief victims, families in need, at-risk youth, and foster children. Michelle currently serves as an intern with the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) providing research for the Combating Trafficking in Persons (CTIP) division for the Eastern Southern Caribbean (ESC) region to safeguard children, empower women, engage stakeholders, governmental and

NGOs, and develop sustainable policies that will help to eliminate human trafficking in the ESC.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Dr. Michelle at: michseg@mail.regent.edu.

References

- Ashkanasy, N. M. (2007). The Australian enigma. In J. S. Chhokar, F.C. Brodbeck, and R. J. House (Eds.). In *Culture and leadership across the world: The GLOBE book of in-depth studies of 25 societies* (pp. 299-333). Mahwah, NJ: Routledge. doi:10.4324/9780203936665.
- Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2002). *Developing Potential Across a Full Range of Leadership TM: Cases on Transactional and Transformational Leadership*. Mahwah, N.J.: Psychology Press. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.regent.edu:2048/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=66188&site=ehost-live>
- Ayman, R., & Korabik, K. (2010). Leadership: Why gender and culture matter. *American psychologist, 65*(3), 157.
- Bass, B. M., & Steidlmeier, P. (1999). Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership behavior. *The Leadership Quarterly, 10*(2), 181-217. doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(99)00016-8.
- Booth, S. (2007). Inspirational variations? Culture and leadership in England. In J. S. Chhokar, F.C. Brodbeck, and R. J. House (Eds.). In *Culture and leadership across the world: The GLOBE book of in-depth studies of 25 societies* (pp. 335-355). Mahwah, NJ: Routledge. doi:10.4324/9780203936665.
- Bouc, A. (1977). *Mao Tse-Tung: A guide to his thought*. New York: NY, St. Martin's Press.
- Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Chemers, M. M. & Ayman, R. (1985). Leadership orientation as a moderator of the relationship between job performance and job satisfaction of Mexican managers. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 11*, pp. 359-367.
- Chhokar, J. S., Brodbeck, F. C., House, R. J. (2007; 2008; 2013). *Culture and leadership across the world: The GLOBE book of in-depth studies of 25 societies* (1st ed.). Mahwah: Routledge. doi:10.4324/9780203936665

- Dorfman, P.W. (1996). International and cross-cultural leadership. In Punnett, J. and Shenkar, O., (Eds.). *Handbook for International Management Research*, Cambridge, UK: Blackwell, 276-349.
- Dorfman, P., Javidan, M., Hanges, P., Dastmalchian, A., & House, R. (2012). GLOBE: A twenty year journey into the intriguing world of culture and leadership. *Journal of World Business*, 47(4), 504-518. doi:10.1016/j.jwb.2012.01.004.
- Fu, P., Wu, R., Yang, Y., & Ye, J. (2007). Chinese culture and leadership. In J. S. Chhokar, F.C. Brodbeck, and R. J. House (Eds.). In *Culture and leadership across the world: The GLOBE book of in-depth studies of 25 societies* (pp. 875-908). Mahwah, NJ: Routledge. doi:10.4324/9780203936665.
- Harris, P.R., Moran, R.T., & Moran, S.V. (2004). *Managing cultural differences: Global leadership for the twenty-first century (6th ed.)*. Oxford, UK: Elsevier-Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Hofstede, G. (1980a). *Culture's consequences*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (1980b). Motivation, leadership, and organization: Do american theories apply abroad? *Organizational Dynamics*, 9(1), 42-63. doi:10.1016/0090-2616(80)90013-3
- Hofstede, G. (1984). Cultural dimensions in management and planning. *Asia Pacific journal of management*, 1(2), 81-99.
- Hofstede, G. (1992). Cultural dimensions in people management. In V. Pucik, N. Tichy, & C. Barnett, (Eds.). *Globalizing management: Creating and leading the competitive organization*. NY, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Hoppe, M. H., & Bhagat, R. S. (2007). Leadership in the United States of America: The leader as cultural hero. In J. S. Chhokar, F.C. Brodbeck, and R. J. House (Eds.). In *Culture and leadership across the world: The GLOBE book of in-depth studies of 25 societies* (pp. 475-535). Mahwah, NJ: Routledge. doi:10.4324/9780203936665.
- Kouzes, J.M. & Posner, B. Z. (2002). *The leadership challenge (3rd ed.)*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Lewin, K., & Lippitt, R. (1938). An experimental approach to the study of autocracy and democracy: A preliminary note. *Sociometry*, 1(3/4), 292-300. doi:10.2307/2785585
- Liddell, W.W. (2005). Project GLOBE: A large scale cross-cultural study of leadership. Problems and perspectives in management, 3(3). Retrieved from <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/793e/8880b49c8a95302518060ed0d15755fc7103.pdf>.

- Moodian, M. A. (2008). *Contemporary leadership and intercultural competence: Exploring the cross-cultural dynamics within organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Northouse, P. G. (2018). *Leadership: Theory and practice (8th ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Romero, E. J. (2004). *Latin American leadership: El patrón & el líder moderno*. *Cross cultural management: An International Journal*, 11(3), 25-37.
doi:10.1108/13527600410797828.
- Ronen, S. (1985). Clustering countries on attitudinal dimensions: A Review and synthesis. *The Academy of Management review*, 10(3), 435-454.
doi:10.5465/AMR.1985.4278955.
- Scandura, T., & Dorfman, P. (2004). Leadership research in an international and cross-cultural context. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15(2), 277-307.
- Schein, E. H. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Schuler, R., Jackson, S., & Jackofsky, E. (1996). Managing human resources in Mexico: A cultural understanding. *Business Horizons*, 39(3): pp. 55-61.
- Yeung, I. Y. M., & Tung, R. L. (1996). Achieving business success in Confucian societies: The importance of guanxi (connections). *Organizational Dynamics*, 25(2), 54-66.
- Yukl, G. A. (2013). *Leadership in organizations (8th ed.)*. Boston, MA: Pearson.