

Survey of leadership styles in different cultures

Gholamreza Taleghani^{1*}, Davood Salmani², Ali Taatian³

1. Faculty of management, University of Tehran

2. Faculty of management, University of Tehran

3. Master of Arts

Abstract:

Leadership is in fact a process of influencing followers. Characteristics of leadership are functions of time and situation and differ in different cultures and countries. Managers of international organizations should obtain enough knowledge of these cultural characteristics and differences and should have the utmost versatility while executing their leadership tasks. In this paper we have conducted a survey of the relation between cultures and styles of leadership in different countries. At first characteristics of leadership are discussed in work oriented leadership paradigm and management regimes, in a number of different regions, including China, Japan, U.S.A, Europe, and Arab countries. We also discuss about cross-cultural leadership concept and its challenges. At the end, a comparative analysis is made over the various leadership styles.

Keywords:

Leadership styles, cultural differences, conceptual leadership model, cross-cultural leadership

*. Corresponding Author , Tel: 09121090719

Email: Ghreza@ut.ac.ir

Introduction:

Leadership is defined as the process of having dominance on group activities in order to realize the objectives. To execute the leadership task, managers try to have influence the people under their supervision and motivate and direct them to achieve the organizational objectives. Creating motivation in staff in such a way that they do their activity and work in the organization with enthusiasm and reach the goals is very important. This problem with transnational managers who have to create motivation in the individuals with different cultures is more significant.

Type's of the behaviors which results in success of the leader depends on the definition of success and is conditions. There are considerable numbers of different leadership styles in different countries and various cultures, and many researches have done many surveys in the field of leadership in which the relation of leadership style with situations conditions has been emphasized.

Leadership styles and management methods across the world are diverse and are influenced by specifications dominant in the environment. Different studies and researches in different countries have emphasized compliance of leadership style in terms of success conditions. The relationship between managers and culture, and leaders and culture is different. Managers tend to be the people who get things done, and the corporate culture is the mechanism they use to understand how to communicate, how to work and what to expect on a day to day basis. The managerial staff knows what the current culture expects, how to feed and nurture the existing culture and how strong or weak the culture is. Managers of transnational organizations should necessarily show flexibility proportional to culture differences, respect to the differences, recognize motivates of the people, and select a suitable style of leadership in accord to situations and then take action with regard to the individuals under their supervision to realize defined objectives. Purpose of this research is to achieve relationship between cultures and leadership styles.

1. Specifications of leadership

One of the most important characteristics of leaders is to have an insight with which they can see what occurs in the group, organization or society and diagnose the way it could be resolved. Such an insight gives leaders

energy and power to work. This energy and power can be created in them by inspiring their followers and motivating them. This inspiration defines their beliefs and converts them to reality.

Leaders inspire their followers to recognize desirable ways and ask them to recognize their leader and to reach to the desirable state that he has specified (Zahedi, 1999).

2. Leadership-culture studies

Several studies are performed about leadership and the key factors in leadership efficiency have been inspected. A characteristic which is regarded positive in a situation might be regarded as a negative specification of leadership in another position. A special style of leadership that is suitable for individualism cultures may lead to defeat in a collectivism culture. Many studies and researches have been done in this field: Geert Hofstede has done researches over different cultures (Hofstede,1980). Another well-known study was done by Bashir Khadra (1990).

Another important research was done by two scholars Smith and Vien (1992) in Australia, Japan, England and Taiwan, emphasizing on the behavior of the dominant person. Finding of this research is the effect of culture on types of dominance strategies. Effect of industrialization on leadership behavior has been considered as an intercultural effect. One of the studies in this field is done by Kamil Kozan (1992) and has concluded that in the countries placed in the low rank of industrialization, autocratic leadership styles are more common than other leadership styles.

Though intensive education and high wage payment may lead staff to comply with the system conditions, tendency to equalize working procedures in the world may confront with nations and native cultures and create tensions in working environments.

One of the issues found frequently in comparative studies is the comparison of Japanese culture with other cultures, specifically American one. An example of these types of research is a research done by Teib et al. (1999) on supervising styles and cultural fields from comparative perspective. In this research, two types of leadership i.e. Task Oriented and People Oriented leaderships in four countries of Japan, US , Britain and Hong Kong are studied. In task oriented leadership, performance of task is emphasized and in people oriented leadership, realization of objectives through morale reinforcement and providing welfare for the staff are of great

importance. The specifications of each of the mentioned styles are defined and specified as below:

Specifications of task oriented leadership

1. It informs staff of the plans and tasks.
2. It directs and instructs them.
3. It determines accurate and clear timeline for performing the works.
4. It is fully aware of work devices and equipments available to the staff.
5. It wants staff to report their work progress.
6. It leads the staff to work in specified time limit.
7. It doesn't allow waste of time due to unsuitable planning.
8. It tries to lead the staff to work in their maximum capacity and ability.

Specifications of People Oriented Leadership

1. It improves working facilities of the staff.
2. It understands attitudes of the people.
3. It wants to know beliefs of the staff.
4. It behaves staff justly.
5. The staffs are available to communicate.
6. It deals with personal problems.
7. It trusts in staff.
8. It is interested in the work future of the staff.
9. It recognizes their good performance.
10. It supports staff.

On the basis of findings of Teib, both two types of leadership are available in all cultures; however the way staffs perceive the distinction between two styles depends on their cultural field. Results of this research show that while a special behavior is regarded task oriented in some culture, it might be considered people oriented in another culture.

People of different cultures have different expectations from their managers and leaders; origin and cultural records of people have effect on formation of their expectations (Mandanghal, 1995). In a research done by Andre Loran, in response to this question that "Is it important that manager accurately knows the answer to questions of his staff which may be related to their work?", different individuals of various cultures have given different answers. In Swedish management viewpoint, this requirement is not available, while Japanese management has emphasized this necessity. Most of the American managers believe that the role of a manager is to help solve

problems, meaning he can help staff detect the ways for solving problems by their own, not he just answers all their questions. The reason is giving solution to all problems causes staff lose their own motivation for innovation and creativity, and finally their productivity decreases. On the other hand, most of French managers believe that manager should give his staff accurate and clear answers so that he can preserve his credit among them.

3. Intercultural leadership contingency model

Combining direction-goal model of Robert House and dividing cultural dimensions in studies done by Geert Hofstede, a model is prepared and the most suitable cultural behavior pattern in 18 countries on this basis is constructed. In this model, leadership is classified into 4 categories: directional leadership (preparing guides for staff about what they should do and how to perform it, work planning, and functional standards), supportive leadership (attention to welfare of the staff and their requirements, establishment of friendly relationships with staff and equal behaviors toward all staff), participatory leadership (consulting with staff and serious attention to their attitudes during decision making), and success oriented leadership (encouraging staff to perform works to the highest levels, determining the goals to such an extent that they can be realized with challenges, expression of trust in high abilities of the staff). On the basis of the findings of this model, participatory leadership is recognized suitable for all studied cultures. This doesn't mean that participatory leadership is the best leadership style in intercultural management; it refers only to its vast application in the world (Mayntz, 1997). However it is not suitable in North Europe, Australia, and New Zealand.

In some regions and countries such as Philippines and Hong Kong, there is high diversity in leadership style. Generally, leadership style should be adapted with cultural environment and space dominant in the organizations (Wiley, 1996). In business leadership, there also is a diversity of models: In America, with its longstanding experience with professional business leadership, the most readily available role model for the head of a company is the corporate CEO. In China and Chinese-related businesses it is the head of the family. In France it remains the military general. In Japan it is the consensus builder. In Germany today it is the coalition builder.

4. Leadership styles in some selected countries

Researches and studies related to leadership and management styles have been done substantially in many countries. In this survey we are going to investigate the leadership fashion in multiple countries and have a comparative analysis. The criteria for selecting countries are that information about the selected countries is accessible and also the sample set includes representatives from industrialized, developed and developing countries and a representative from Arab countries in the study. This makes the study comprehensive to a proper extend.

Japan

The rapid economic development of Asia in recent decades is one of the most important events in history. This development continues today and there is every reason to anticipate that it will continue indefinitely unless derailed by possible but unlikely international conflicts. At the core of Asian economic development is its business leadership—managers and entrepreneurs who sustain and create Asian companies. Do they exhibit the same leadership styles as top executives in the West? In the culture of Japanese people, human being has special value according to Confucius instructions; they believe in endless force of human being and put importance on human training and training innovators. Japanese organizations see their staff as their asset in this culture and regard human resources development as a very important matter. Many organizations use regulations and laws to lead their staff to perform tasks and some of them emphasize cultural norms and values as the mechanism of dominance on staff. In Japan, if there are laws and regulations, norm orientation is dominant on legalism. According to some researches, functionality of Japanese staff is controlled by their own colleagues in the working groups.

Japanese worker doesn't kick the bucket because in such case, it leads to humiliation of other members of the group. In Japan, manager supervises the functionality of the working group instead of paying attention to individual functionality and encourages or admonishes them.

One of the essential values which have effect on leadership behavior in Japan is to wish others' kindness (Lerner,1981). The Japanese learn from the childhood that they rely on others' kindness and enjoy this kindness.

Two other cultural values having influence on leadership behavior in Japan are commitment feeling and moral pressure of the society. Commitment feeling means a kind of feeling a person perceives after

receiving a favor or observing good practice of another person; Human communication in Japan is based on the network of mutual commitments which every one is obliged to comply with. Moral pressure of the society means that social standards force everyone to assume liability in the others (E. Ward,1978).

Value-based model of leader and follower relation in Japan is based on kindness and friendship. One of the Japanese sociologists believes that the basis of Japanese society is the relation between two persons in high and low position. This relationship resembles the relationship between parents and child which is called 'Oyaboon' and 'Kerboon'.

Japanese managers spend more time for solving problems of their inferiors that American managers do and they try to find the problem and help solve it. Japanese managers enjoy more to support their superior managers than the American and Indian managers do.

Generally, major characteristics of Japanese leaders including seriousness, continuous work, cooperation and coordination with others, ability to establish close relationship with colleagues, tolerance of hardships and difficulties of work, self-discipline, ability to control demands and personal feelings and sympathy with followers in Japanese society have changed in terms of values and economic systems but traditional leadership standards are still remained fixed. We can summarize leadership specifications in Japan in comparison with other countries as follows:

1. Japanese leaders compared with leaders of other societies have less power of control because they are expected to have warm and good relationships with their followers and followers are allowed to decide due to their own attitudes and decisions, to an extent.
2. Fidelity of the inferior to the superior in Japanese moral framework is a virtue. In return, the superior should allow inferior to express this fidelity and it is expected that leader rely on his followers to remove his weak points.
3. Leaders should try to decrease rate of conflictions, quarrels, oppositions, tensions and anxieties among their followers.
4. The highest efficiency of leader is associated with his ability to understand the followers and to attract their attentions.

Other major specifications of Japanese management system include team work, collective decision making, job rotations, flexibility in work, long term employment, mutual emotional relationship between employer

and employee, system of promotion on the basis of superiority, group assessment and group bonus.

China

Political connections and family control are more common in Asian businesses. Chinese people also have been influenced by Confucius instructions for 5000 years. Most people in this country have unchanging Confucius thoughts in their character. Chinese culture is significantly effective on the function of management. Some of the cultural specifications effective on organizational behavior in this country are as follows:

1. Decision making concentration
2. Limited partnership
3. Dominance of “secondary groups” on the “primary groups”
4. Importance of relation orientation
5. Administrative corruption
6. Belief in grievance and necessity of coordination with nature
7. Importance of face and face-to-face conduct
8. Special attitude to time

The powerful character which is illustrated by Confucius School plays an important role in centralization of power in Chinese organizations (Constitution of the People’s Republic of China ,1978). Superiors don’t believe in the inferiors and prevent from conveying power to them. Limited partnership is a direct result of concentration in decision making. Beliefs such as “necessity of conservatism” and “silence is gold” also lead to decrease in participation of the inferiors in management of affairs related to work place.

In this regard, supervisors are assumed to control affairs and don’t allow the inferiors to participate effectively. Emphasis on secondary groups and decrease in the role of primary group are also result of the same centralized system. Decisions about the key and major issues are made by considering the interests of the decision makers (secondary groups) and the beneficiary groups. Primary groups which comprise most people are forced to be silent.

Due to the dominance of hierarchical relationship, progress and promotion of staff depend on their relationship with higher levels of management or political powers rather than their individual function (Sun,1980).

USA

American CEOs tend to use one of five leadership styles: directive, participative, empowering, charismatic, or celebrity. There is less **freedom of action** for executives and boards in America than in Asia. US has no congruent culture since different individuals with different culture records have immigrated to this country. However group of general tendencies are observable in common history of Americans. Some of these tendencies are as follows:

1. Categorizing human being as good or bad
2. Noncompulsory thinking
3. Dominance on nature
4. Individualism
5. Functionalism
6. Attention to present and future instead of past

In summary, Americans know human beings either good or bad (in contrary to Confucius communities which regard nature of all human being good). In USA, government has imposed severe penal laws for regulating behaviors of the people. Americans have noncompulsory thought, and believe in performance of work and change rather than acceptance of fate. American people know themselves dominant on the nature, have tendency to solution of problems and emphasize on three variables of structure, strategy and system. Hofstede has recognized Americans as the most individualist nation in the world. In his view, people in individualism culture enjoy personal particulars and successes in order to define themselves, while in collectivist societies such as China and Japan, they emphasize on unity and group fidelity. In collectivist societies, supervisors rely on fidelity of staff, reliability and coordinated group relationship with others and for this purpose they prefer to select staff among their friends and relatives, while in USA to employ friends or family members is not a good act and regarded even destructive. Americans put value on the work and put importance on planning and decide what to do and when. They believe that one can achieve success through practice. American managers believe that they can control their environment and what occurs in it, and they assume themselves responsible for the problems out of home such as strikes and economic events (Jacoby,1973).

Achievement of natural profuse resources and financial equipments have attracted attention of the Americans and led to reinforcement of self-centered morale in them and their superiority on others and disdaining

people of other cultures and nations. Americans have progressed in self-consciousness. They believe they are master of the world and confide in continuation of their superiority.

Europe

Comparison of management styles between European countries is done by Management Research Group, a firm specializing in the creation of behavioral assessment instruments used for individual and organizational development. MRG compared the leadership behaviors of almost 4,000 individuals in management positions (from first line department supervisors to company presidents) in eight European countries including Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, the Republic of Ireland, the Netherlands, Sweden and the UK. Through this research, it was found that there are 3 factors common in all these nations:

1. Expertise: their level of technical expertise and orientation toward detail and in-depth analyses. As a group they tend to put some emphasis on this aspect of the leadership role, but do not make it a focus of their approach.
2. Competitiveness: how forceful they are, and the extent to which they will push to achieve results. European managers, in general, will tend to look for win-win solutions vs. behaving competitively.
3. Setting standards of Excellence: their ability to set expectations for themselves and their organizations and their willingness to work hard to achieve results. Once again, they spend some time on these types of activities, but it is not necessarily their top priority.

However there are distinctive characteristics for each country:

Sweden

The most unique management style among the Europeans belongs to the Swedish leaders. Of all the Europeans, the Swedish managers rate themselves as the most innovative. They feel comfortable in fast-changing environments, are willing to take risks and to consider new and untested approaches. This experimental attitude generally applies to the short term, with a focus on the present and a predisposition to trust their instincts rather than to analyze data. The Swedish are likely to spend the least amount of time thinking ahead and planning. Instead, they have a hands-on approach that allows them to act quickly, using practical strategies to accomplish pragmatic business goals and achieve immediate results. Because of their

tendency to be in the middle of the action, Swedish managers spend less time developing and utilizing guidelines and procedures or monitoring progress to goals in a systematic way.

In addition to their action orientation, the Swedish management approach has a distinctive people and team orientation. Swedish managers are friendly, meet people easily, and adapt an informal and easy, although somewhat reserved, style when interacting with others. They sincerely care about people, and work to develop close bonds and supportive relationships. They use a group oriented decision-making style that asks for input and advice from others, respects and values others' ideas, and uses the wisdom of the team in coming to conclusions. Tasks are accomplished by enlisting the talents of others to meet objectives, and in so doing, giving them sufficient autonomy to exercise their own judgment. For Swedish managers, helping others to develop is a key leadership task.

Swedish managers do not see themselves as particularly persuasive and tend not to try to sell their ideas. Rather, they let the ideas speak for themselves. The Swedish use language to describe rather than convince, and provide information on more of a "need to know" basis, as opposed to spending time ensuring that everyone is kept informed. Although they are reluctant to state clearly what they want and expect from others, Swedish managers quickly let others know what they think of them and whether the other person has met their needs and expectations.

Scandinavian Countries

In comparison, Danish managers have a style that is much less team oriented than the Swedish, and more strategic, analytical, and demanding. Danish leaders are apt to be independent thinkers, and although they are as involved in the day-to-day activities as Swedish managers, they take less for granted, setting deadlines and monitoring progress in a more formal fashion. Because of their more independent decision making style, they spend more time in selling their ideas and in communicating expectations. The Danish managers in our study are far more likely to enjoy being in positions of authority, taking charge and directing the efforts of others, than were any of the other European managers. They are also the most persistent and goal oriented and only moderately willing to accommodate and help others. This more self-centered and task driven style of the Danes is softened by the ability to be seen as friendly and outgoing, and to quickly establish relationships.

Germany and France

In recent years, Germany and France have forged a tumultuous alliance, first driving the introduction of the Euro, and now defining the political agenda for the European Union. The differences in approach are not surprising when we look at the differences in leadership style.

The German managers in this study rate themselves among the highest in Europe at setting direction for the future. They are second only to the Swedes in their ability to embrace new ideas and perspectives. But unlike the Swedish managers, these ideas are weighed against past practices, minimizing risk by building on knowledge gained through experience as well as current expertise. For Germans, plans are made after in-depth study, taking a long-range and broad approach, and thinking through the implications of decisions by projecting into the future.

Conversely, the French are the least likely of all European managers to reflect on the past. French managers see their work as an intellectual challenge which needs mental and intellectual power. Attitude of these managers is based on wisdom, wit and sagacity rather than practice. French organizations have centralized structure and emphasize on hierarchy of will and respect for validity of authority. Managers of the organizations have full power of decisions making and control on the organization. Managers believe that they have gained their position as a result of personal wisdom and believe that they should be aware of everything which is in the system and receive reports of all works so that they can control their decisions. One of the French managers says to his staff: "I want to be aware of all your activities!". That is why French managers resist to flexible structures of the organization. French managers believe in holy principle of commandeering unit and it is impossible for them to imagine giving report to several heads which is common in Matrix Structures. Formality, mightiness, superiors' expectation of inferiors, respect for the superiors are evident specifications of French organizations.

In France, participatory methods in decision making and aiming are not common and wisdom and smartness are the most important criteria for leadership in all fields (Birnbaum 1987). Although more highly educated, they are less technically oriented than the Germans tend to be, and more likely to take a short-term view. And, like the Swedish managers, the French tend to use instincts rather than analysis. The French personal style is outgoing, operating with a good deal of energy, intensity, and emotional

expression. The French manager will be found in the center of the action. The Germans are more understated and subdued. Where the French manager would project warmth and acceptance, the German would tend to maintain distance and be more aloof. German managers display less energy, are more difficult to get to know, and have a more formal style that is based on role and responsibility within the hierarchy rather than personal magnetism. While the Germans are skeptical of those in authority, the French are loyal to the organization and will consult superiors and defer to people above them. Of all the European managers, the French are the least comfortable in the management position, placing less emphasis on taking charge and more emphasis on seeking the advice of others, creating and valuing close supportive relationships. The Germans, on the other hand, are comfortable in a leadership role and are willing to take command, and may in fact have difficulty when required to function as a team member rather than a team leader.

Belgium and the Netherlands

The Dutch also have some distinct leadership characteristics. In comparison to other European leaders, the Dutch managers in our study are the most independent decision-makers. They are the least likely to accept rules and decisions of others in authority or to ask peers for their input and advice. They have only moderate concern for the needs of others, and are comfortable doing things on their own and making their own decisions. Managers from the Netherlands put the most emphasis of all European managers on selling their ideas and winning people over to their perspective. This selling job is assisted by a lot of personal energy, and the ability to transmit that enthusiasm to others. The Dutch leaders are the least organized and structured of all the managers studied, but are similar to other Europeans in terms of their personal involvement in the day-to-day aspects of the business, their ability to be pragmatic, communicate expectations, establish criteria for success, delegate responsibility, and monitor performance against plans.

In Belgium, the managers are standard bearers for past practices, well aware of problems that have been faced before and the knowledge to avoid them in the future. They have the greatest respect for authority and loyalty to the organization and the greatest willingness to compromise and put the needs of the organization above their own personal objectives. And like the French, although for probably somewhat different reasons, the Belgian

managers showed some discomfort in the leadership role. Although reasonably outgoing by European standards, the Belgian managers, together with the Dutch, work the hardest to control their emotions. This reserve makes it possible for both groups to project a calm and objective demeanor, perform well under stress, and potentially be keen negotiators.

UK and Ireland

There are some minor differences between Irish and UK managers, but for the most part their styles are very similar to each other. The Irish leaders saw themselves as more apt to use past experience as a guide to current decision making, to develop technical expertise, to put processes and structure in place to ensure goals are met and tasks completed. Irish managers are also more willing to subordinate personal goals for the good of the group. The UK managers are more likely to delegate tasks and responsibility and solicit input and ideas from others. Both groups of leaders are comfortable in the management role and, like the Dutch, are willing to make decisions on a more independent basis.

Arab Countries

Leadership behavior in Arabic societies is influenced by tribal traditions on one hand and western methods on the other hand. Many Arab managers behave like their fathers. Result of this behavior is in compliance with authoritative style found especially in large organizations. Most of the Arabic organizations whether in public sector or in private sector are managed with mightiness styles and in the centralized form, no matter what their strategy and their utilized technology are. Dominance of tribal relations on managers limits possibility of working with individuals out of family and relatives. Use of innovative and creative styles is not common for solving problems and breaking organizational norms in Arab countries and organizational problems are settled in terms of tribal and cultural values (Jerisat, 2004). These values with values dominant in tribal system have led to Sheikh system.

Major specifications of this system include:

1- hierarchical power, 2- compliance of regulations and laws with personalities, 3- priority of relation on order, 4- instability and hesitance in decision making, 5- paternalism system in leadership, 6- nepotism in high organizational levels, 7- open doors policies

Dominance of the West on the styles of Arab managers has led to duality. On one hand, Arabs are interested in formation of legal and formulated associations and on the other hand they are interested in their own traditional methods (Khadra, 1990).

5. Cross-Cultural Leadership

It is almost cliché to say that there has been an explosion in the amount of research on leadership in a

cross-cultural context. Dikson et al. have published a great survey on leadership in a cross-cultural context focusing on the Culture Dimensions theory of Hofstede. Having studied the existing literature, they analyze the results of a great multinational research called GLOBE (the Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness research project) , done over 62 countries. The primary definitional question cross-cultural leadership researchers wrestle with is, quite simply, “What is a ‘cross-cultural leader?’”. The term “cross-cultural leadership research” is itself confusing, because of its ambiguity. It can refer to the study of people from one culture who find themselves in leadership situations in other cultures (e.g., the expatriate manager). It can also refer to the comparison of leadership research findings from one culture to those from a different culture. Graen et al. (1997) have focused on the former definition, and have written about the type of person needed to conduct cross-cultural research and to be a cross-cultural leader. Graen et al. argue that the people involved in both of these endeavors need to be people who are not only open to the differences they encounter when interacting with other cultures. They must also show respect for cultures very different from their own, be able to overcome their own enculturation, and recognize what aspects of their personal values systems are a result of their

own cultural experience. In one such article, Graen and Hui (1999) argue that the perceptions of what it means to be a global leader are changing. No longer will “geocentric globetrotters” who are transferred from country to country to manage foreign operations be seen as the exemplars of the global leader. Instead, “trans-cultural creative leaders” will be required. These are people who can “learn to (1) transcend their childhood acculturation and respect very different cultures; (2) build cross-cultural partnerships of mutual trust, respect, and obligation; (3) engage in cross-cultural creative problem solving to resolve conflicts; and (4) help construct third cultures in various operations.”

Trying to define a “universal” leader, Lonner identified several types of “universal” relationships, including:

1. The ‘simple universal’, which is a phenomenon that is constant throughout the world. Specifically, a simple universal occurs when means do not vary across cultures;
2. The ‘variform universal’, which refers to cases in which a general statement or principle holds across cultures but the enactment of this principle differs across cultures (i.e., culture moderates the relationship); and
3. The ‘functional universal’, which occurs when the within-group relationship between two variables is the same across cultures. In other words, within-country correlations between variables are nonvariant across cultures.
4. Bass (1997) then introduced two other relevant conceptualizations of universality, including:
5. The ‘variform functional universal’, which occurs when the relationship between two variables is always found, but the relationship’s magnitude changes across cultures; and
6. The ‘systematic behavioral universal’, which is a principle or theory that explains if-then outcomes across cultures and organizations. Systematic behavioral universals involve theories that claim either a sequence of behavior is invariant over cultures, or the structure or organization of a behavior or behavioral cluster is constant over cultures.

In the Dickson paper several cases have been mentioned to show that a positive leadership attribute in one culture is not necessarily positive in other cultures: In the United States, contingent punishment had positive effects but undesirable effects in the other countries. Directive leadership behaviors had positive effects in Taiwan and Mexico, while participative leadership behaviors had positive effects in the United States and South Korea. Thus, simple universality was again only slightly supported. Several factors have led to a decline in the volume of research focused on identifying simple universals. In investigating interpersonal acumen factor, another example is that leaders in Colombia rated cunning as contributing to outstanding leadership, whereas in Switzerland cunning, or being sly and deceitful, is rated as inhibiting outstanding leadership.

One way to approach the study of culture is through the identification and measurement of dimensions of culture, and several different typologies

of societal cultural value orientations or culture dimensions have been developed. Regarding to five dimensional model of Hofstede (Power Distance, Uncertainty Avoidance, Collectivism-Individualism, Masculinity-Femininity, Short-term vs. long-term Orientation), universal rules are derived on the relation of culture and leadership (Dickson et al., 2003). Hofstede released the measurements for each of his five indicators in several countries in his website.

Due to his research, autocratic leadership is more acceptable and effective in high Power Distance societies. Power distance also plays a role in employees' willingness to accept supervisory direction, and on their emphasis on gaining support from those in positions of authority. Bu, Craig, and Peng (2001) compared the willingness to accept supervisory direction among Chinese, Taiwanese and U.S. employees through a vignette study. Overall, Chinese employees had the strongest tendency to accept direction and the US employees the least. Chinese employees were most sensitive to the consistency between the supervisory direction and company policies, and were less responsive to their own assessment of the merit of the directions they were given. These findings are in line with results from the more elaborate research on event management.

Discussing on Uncertainty Avoidance factor, Dikson claims that in societies high on UA, career stability, formal rules and the development of expertise tend to be valued, whereas in low UA cultures, more flexibility in roles and jobs, an emphasis on general rather than specialized skills and more job mobility is more typical.

Collectivism positively affects the role of participative leadership and supports transformational leaders. Hofstede (2001) holds that masculine and feminine cultures create different leader hero types. The heroic manager in masculine cultures is decisive, assertive, and aggressive. In feminine cultures, the "hero" is less visible, seeks consensus, and is intuitive and cooperative rather than tough and decisive. Overall Hofstede explains how societal culture affects the organizational culture in which leadership plays a significant role.

6. Conclusion and discussion

There are nine key qualities people seek in a successful leader:

- Passion
- Decisiveness
- Conviction

- Integrity
- Adaptability
- Emotional Toughness
- Emotional Resonance
- Self-Knowledge
- Humility

The emotionalism that goes with passion is more common in America than elsewhere. Europeans see it as a sort of business evangelicalism and are very suspicious of it. Decisiveness is common to effective executives in all countries: In this regard European and Japanese chief executives are the most consensus-oriented, and Chinese and American top executives are more likely to make decisions personally and with their own accountability. Conviction is common to all. Integrity is a complex characteristic very much determined by national cultures. What is honest in one society is not in another, and vice versa.

Adaptability is a pronounced characteristic of American leadership generally. It is less common and less valued in Asia and Europe. It will be needed everywhere soon enough. Emotional toughness is common to all top executives; Americans spend more time trying not to show it. Emotional resonance, the ability to grasp what motivates others and appeal effectively to it, is most important in the United States and Europe at this point in time. It will become more important in Asia as living standards improve, knowledge workers become more important, professional management gets greater demand, and CEOs have to compete for managerial talent. Self-knowledge is important in avoiding the sort of over-reach so common in America; it is less common a virtue in America than in Asia, and is strength of the Asian executive. Humility is a very uncommon trait in the American CEO. It is sometimes found in Asia. It is often a trait of the most effective leaders, as it was in the best-respected of all American political leaders, Abraham Lincoln.

Leadership could be defined as influencing teamwork with the aim of securing certain goals. Managers endeavor to carry out leadership tasks in a way to affect the employees whom they are in charge of and to orient their endeavors in the direction of predefined organizational goals. These managers should motivate their employees in such a way that they voluntarily try to accomplish organizational goals.

With regard to what was mentioned, leadership styles and management methods have abundant variety and diversity and are influenced by cultural specifications dominant in the environment. Certainly due to cultural differences, one cannot talk about special leadership style for the managers of transnational organizations to behave like it. Such style which has been applied in all cultures and gives the same answer is not found and it is necessary for leadership behavior to conform to native and local parameters.

In different researches on test of theories of motivation in international level, this issue is confirmed and one cannot generalize a theory to the entire world and in many countries these theories are not applicable. For example, some researchers from different countries in the world have introduced the theory of hierarchy of Abraham Maslow's requirements. In some countries it has been confirmed and in some other countries, it is rejected. The requirements which have been introduced in this hierarchy are available everywhere but their precedence and subsequences are different in the five orders considered by Maslow.

Regarding to numerous differences in understandings, needs and demands of the staff in international dimensions which are the origins of styles, methods and many diverse achievements in the field of management and leadership in the world's countries, difficulty and importance of effort taken by the managers of transnational organizations becomes undeniable in finding suitable ways to create motivation in the staff. In this regard, art of transnational managers is that they show required flexibility to cultural differences, know the staff well, are aware of their needs and respect for the differences, recognize the motivations of the individuals and select a suitable leadership style to an appropriate level and take action to realize predefined goals.

According to the presented research, the relation between cultures and leadership styles is confirmed, therefore the managers are recommended to pay attention to cultural differences in the organizations in order to have more effective and efficient leadership, and to recognize cultures existing in their work scope correctly to provide a suitable style of leadership.

References

1. Bass, B. M. (1997), *"Does the transactional-transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries?"*, American Psychologist, Vol. 52, No. 2, pp. 130-139.
2. Birnbaum, Pierre (1987), *"Polity with a strong state"*, Greenwood Press, France.
3. Bu, N., Craig, T. J., Peng, T. K., (2001), *"Acceptance of supervisory direction in typical workplace situation: A comparison of US, Taiwanese and PRC employees"*, International Journal of Cross Cultural Management, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 131-152.
4. *Constitution of the people's republic of china (1978)*, Beijing, Foreign Language Press, New York.
5. D. Quinn Mills (2005), *"Asian and American Leadership Styles: How are they unique?"*
6. E. Ward, Robert (1978), *"Japan's political system"*, Vol. 2, Englewood Cliffs, prentice- Hall.
7. Graen, G. B., Hui, C. (1999), *"Transcultural global leadership in the twenty-first century: challenges and implications for development, advances in global leadership"*, vol. 1, pp. 9-26, Stamford, CT: JAL Press.
8. Graen, G. B., Hui, C., Wakabayashi, M. , Wang, Z. (1997), *"Cross-cultural research alliances in organizational research"*.
9. Helen Peters and Robert Kabacoff (2010), *"Global or local"*, The Impact of Country Culture on Leadership Style in Europe .
10. Hofstede, G (1980), *"Culture's consequences: international differences in work- related values"*, Beverly Hills, Calif: Sage.
11. Hofstede, G. , Peterson, M (2000), *"Culture: national values and organizational practices, Handbook of organizational culture and climate"* , pp. 401-416, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
12. <http://www.geert-hofstede.com/>
13. Jacoby, Henry (1973), *"The bureaucratization of the world"*, Berkeley, CA, University of California Press.
14. Jerisat, Jamil (2004), *"Governance in a globalizing world"*, Tampa, Florida, USA, P2.
15. Khadra, Bashir(1990), *"International study on management and organization"*, p37.

16. Lerner, Urban C. (1981), "*Tanaka former Japan leader*", *Wield Big Power Despite Corruption Charges*. *Wall street Journal*, May 6, p 30.
17. Lonner, W. J. (1980), "The research for psychological universals", *Perspective handbook of cross-cultural psychology*, vol. 1, pp. 143-204, Boston: Allyn and Bacon
18. Mandanghal, Mark (1995), "*Global management*", p 580.
19. Marcus W. Dickson, Deanne N. Den Hartog, Jacqueline K. Mitchelson (2003), "Research on leadership in a cross-cultural context: Making progress, and raising new questions".
20. Mayntz, M (1997), "*Executive Leadership in Germany*", p144.
21. N. Kamil Kozan (1992), "Theory and research in conflict Management".
22. Sun, Y (1980), "What is the Origin of the Law of Value?", *Social Science in China*, pp. 155-71.
23. Wiley, John (1996), "*Multicultural work space management*", p 95.
24. Zahedi, Shamsolsadat (1999), "*Comparative study on leadership styles*", *governmental management*, 45&46, 14-32.