

Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies

<http://jlo.sagepub.com>

Toward a Cultural Contingency Model of Leadership

Jan P. Muczyk and Daniel T. Holt

Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies 2008; 14; 277

DOI: 10.1177/1548051808315551

The online version of this article can be found at:
<http://jlo.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/14/4/277>

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

On behalf of:



[Midwest Academy of Management](#)

Additional services and information for *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://jlo.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://jlo.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

Citations <http://jlo.sagepub.com/cgi/content/refs/14/4/277>

Toward a Cultural Contingency Model of Leadership

Jan P. Muczyk

Air Force Institute of Technology

Daniel T. Holt

Air Force Institute of Technology

To succeed in today's economy, multinational and transnational organizations must have strong leaders who are versed in global leadership principles. Unfortunately, 85% of *Fortune* 500 executives report that their firms lack enough competent global leaders. Relying on leadership theories based solely on North American experiences will unlikely ameliorate this shortfall. Accordingly, the authors integrate the Project GLOBE cultural imperatives with mainstream leadership dimensions to produce global leadership prescriptions. Examples of regional leadership styles based on regional cultural determinants are also provided. This prospective framework serves as a springboard to help guide and develop leaders who wish to transcend geographical boundaries and effectively lead in a culturally diverse, global context.

Keywords: *leadership; global leadership; management styles; situational leadership*

Until recently, most of the post–World War II leadership literature has been generated by American scholars (Koopman et al., 1999; Nadler, 2002). Yet the global leadership construct should not be a particularly American one, if for no other reason than the world is rapidly becoming a global economic village, characterized by multinational and transnational firms. A survey of *Fortune* 500 executives showed that having competent global leaders was the most important factor in business success and that 85% of the executives did not think they had an adequate number of competent global leaders (Javidan & House, 2001). Because organizational cultures are influenced by national cultures, leadership approaches might be effectively tailored to align with national cultures. This is only possible if leadership theory is presented in a global contingency framework.

Since the close of World War II, for example, democratic values have permeated most U.S. institutions even though unqualified support for democratic leadership is not always justified on the basis of research evidence (Muczyk & Reimann, 1987; Muczyk & Steele, 1998). Democratic values, on the

other hand, have not been as prevalent around the globe. In the Middle East, with the exception of Israel, there are no democratic traditions, and we should not be surprised. After all, democracy is a European invention dating back to the ancient Greek city-states. And modern Israel was founded by Europeans—the Ashkenazi Jews—who brought the European parliamentary system with them. In the rest of the Middle East, the legacy established by the early Caliphs—successors to Mohammed and his close friends or relatives—set expectations for posterity. An autocrat ruled so long as he was on good behavior. In 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. All along, the touchstone of good leadership in that part of the world seems to have revolved around the concept of justice, not democracy. Inevitably, such a pervasive tradition spills over into the world of work (Muczyk, 2003). In a global economy, the differences that emerge cannot be ignored, especially when one considers a region like the Middle East, which encompasses close to 300 million people, contains 60% of the world's oil reserves, and has 40% of the world's natural gas reserves.

Similarly, other economic colossi warrant significant attention. China is rapidly becoming the next

Authors' Note: Address correspondence to Daniel T. Holt, Graduate School of Engineering and Management, Air Force Institute of Technology, 2950 Hobson Way, Wright Patterson AFB, OH 45433; phone: (228) 365-7928 (cell); e-mail: Daniel.Holt@afit.edu.

economic center. Moreover, U.S. firms are attempting to penetrate this huge market by (a) outsourcing numerous economic activities to Chinese firms and (b) importing a variety of products from China. Clearly, there is no democratic tradition in China, and that includes the workplace (Batson, 2007). Consequently, the prevalent U.S. leadership style may not be suited for this culture. India is another emerging economic powerhouse that has much stronger democratic traditions. In fact, the British Raj (1858-1947) left India as the most populous democracy in the world. It is doubtful, however, that those traditions extend to the workplace because democracy was not introduced into the workplace (Mines & Gourishankar, 1990).

From a more theoretical perspective, the need to align leadership and culture can be explained with social exchange theory. Put simply, social exchange theory suggests that a person feels a moral obligation to repay any benefits that he or she is provided by another (Blau, 1964). Social exchanges occur frequently between employees and their leaders. It would be reasonable to expect employees to perform in ways that help the leader facilitate organizational performance when the leader offers benefits that induce a sense of obligation (i.e., aligning benefits with individuals' expectations or values). Empirical evidence has supported this theory, suggesting that this sense of obligation is present across cultures (Deluga, 1992; Howell & Hall-Merenda, 1999).

In essence, global leaders should adapt, aligning leadership processes with cultural demands (Walumbwa, Lawler, & Avolio, 2007). Toward this end, we integrate the recent research on cultural imperatives derived from multinational samples with the mainstream leadership constructs developed from North American experiences. By doing this, we provide practitioners a springboard that can help them guide the selection, training, career development, and assessment of global leaders. Researchers may benefit from a speculative framework to test the antecedents and outcomes of leadership success in a global context.

Factors for A Global Contingency Model

There is considerable support for a global leadership contingency model. Laurent (1983), for instance, studied the attitudes and behaviors of managers in nine European countries, the United States, Japan, and Indonesia. His effort revealed unique managerial modus

operandi in each country. Specifically, there were differences of opinion regarding the role of hierarchy, the acceptability of bypassing the chain of command, and the belief that managers possess precise answers to subordinates' questions. Ronen and Shenkar (1985) highlighted differences as they classified countries on attitudinal dimensions, developing nine clusters: Near Eastern, Nordic, Arab, Germanic, Far Eastern, Latin American, Latin European, Anglo, and Independent. More recently, Brodbeck et al. (2000) found that individuals from different regions valued different characteristics among leaders. Not all differences, however, are related to the exercise of leadership, and recommending concrete leadership styles on the basis of all or most of Laurent's, Ronen and Shenkar's, and Brodbeck et al.'s findings does not appear to be practical.

Thus, we turned to Hofstede (1983) and the research of Project GLOBE (Javidan & House, 2001) to guide us as we matched leadership styles with culture. Initially, Hofstede identified four dimensions that shaped leadership style: (a) *uncertainty avoidance* concerns the degree to which people are comfortable with ambiguous situations and with the inability to predict future events with accuracy; (b) *masculinity-femininity* represents the degree to which a culture emphasizes assertiveness, dominance, and independence; (c) *individualism-collectivism* refers to the tendency of a culture's norms and values to emphasize satisfying either individual or group needs; and (d) *power distance* indicates the degree to which members of a society accept differences in power and status among themselves. Several researchers have reinforced the importance of these four dimensions. Early (1993), for instance, highlighted the importance of the individualistic versus collectivistic dimensions in shaping a prescribed leadership style when a given culture is considered.

More recently, Project GLOBE researchers (Javidan, Dorfman, de Luque, & House, 2006; Javidan & House, 2001) have identified nine cultural attributes that have important managerial implications. These include (a) assertiveness, (b) future orientation, (c) gender differentiation, (d) uncertainty avoidance, (e) power distance, (f) collectivism versus individualism, (g) in-group collectivism, (h) performance orientation, and (i) humane orientation. Obviously, there is a considerable overlap between Hofstede's (1993) work and Project GLOBE (Javidan & House, 2001; Javidan et al., 2006). Furthermore, Project GLOBE incorporates the research of Trompenaars and Hamden-Turner (1998) and Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) where

Table 1
Factors to Consider When Selecting a Global Leadership Style

Based on Project GLOBE (Javidan & House, 2001) and Hofstede (1983)

1. *Assertiveness*—the extent to which a society encourages people to be tough, confrontational, assertive, and competitive versus modest and tender.
2. *Future orientation*—the extent to which a society encourages and rewards future-oriented behaviors such as planning, investing in the future, and delaying gratification.
3. *Gender differentiation*—the extent to which a society maximizes gender role differences.
4. *Uncertainty avoidance*—the degree to which members of a society seek orderliness, consistency, structure, formalized procedures and laws to cover situations in their daily lives.
5. *Power distance*—the degree to which members of a society expect power to be unequally shared. The extent to which a community maintains inequality among its members by stratification with respect to power, authority, prestige, status, wealth, and material possessions.
6. *Collectivism versus individualism*—the degree to which individuals are encouraged by societal institutions to be integrated into groups within organizations and the society as opposed to operating as independent agents.
7. *In-group collectivism*—the extent to which members of a society take pride in membership in small groups, such as their families and circles of close friends, and the organization in which they are employed.
8. *Performance orientation*—the degree to which a society encourages and rewards group members for performance improvement and excellence.
9. *Humane orientation*—the degree to which a society encourages and rewards individuals for being fair, altruistic, generous, caring, and kind to others.

Based on Trompenaars and Hamden-Turner (1998)

10. *Internal versus external environmental orientations*—the degree to which a society believes the environment or the individual controls events. Those cultures with an internal environmental orientation believe that individuals are masters of their own fates and that success and the results at work are a function of individual ability and effort. Cultures that are characterized by an external environmental orientation believe that the environment exercises significant control. Such cultures rely on such concepts as luck and fate to explain events and the results of individual efforts at work.

Based on Laurent (1983)

11. *Perceived role of hierarchy and acceptability of bypassing the chain of command*

these research teams suggest how different managerial practices might be received in different cultures.

We also felt it would be prudent to capture the way a culture views the environment's influence over situations and how these views relate to leadership style in a global, contingency context. Trompenaars and Hamden-Turner (1998) explain that societies differ on how they view the environment. They state that many societies believe that the things affecting individuals' lives reside within the individual; in these cultures, motivations and values are derived from within. Others, in contrast, view the environment as more powerful and influential, wherein the environment, rather than the individual, shapes outcomes. The Middle East (22 countries and approximately 300 million people) clearly demonstrates the latter view. In this region, many believe that everything is foreordained by God, as evidenced by the ubiquitous use of the term *Insha'Allah*, which means "If God wills it." We both have lived and worked in the Middle East recently, and we have firsthand experience with the motivational drawbacks associated with this collective attitude.

Table 1 summarizes the cultural factors that we feel guide recommendations for matching leadership styles on the basis of culture. As we have suggested, we have included attitudes toward the environment (Trompenaars & Hamden-Turner, 1998), terming these *internal* versus *external* environmental orientations. Also, Laurent's (1983) perceived role of hierarchy and the acceptability of bypassing the chain of command have been included because the expectations of workers regarding where decisions are to be made has a bearing on leadership. Hofstede's (1983) ideas have been implicitly incorporated through the Project GLOBE recommendations.

Organizing The Leadership Construct

Before the contingency framework can be built, the concept of leadership must be clarified. The position we adopt sides with that of Mintzberg (1973), who considers leadership 1 of 10 managerial roles. Not to do so would run the risk of equating leadership

Table 2
Universal Attributes That Facilitate Leadership Effectiveness, Impede Effectiveness, and Vary With Culture

Universal facilitators
Being trustworthy, just, and honest (integrity)
Having foresight and planning ahead (charismatic–visionary)
Being positive, dynamic, encouraging, and motivating and building confidence (charismatic–inspirational)
Being communicative, informed, a coordinator, and a team integrator (team builder)
Universal impediments
Being a loner and asocial (self-protective)
Being noncooperative and irritable (malevolent)
Being dictatorial (autocratic)
Culturally contingent
Being individualistic (autonomous)
Being status conscious (status conscious)
Being a risk taker (charismatic–self-sacrificial)

SOURCE: Adapted from Javidan, Dorfman, de Luque, and House (2006).

with practically every topic appearing in a management or organizational behavior text. Muczyk and Adler (2002) suggest several interesting questions regarding this issue. For instance, good leaders make sound decisions. Is decision making then part of the leadership definition? Effective leaders are good communicators. Is communication part of the leadership construct? Successful leaders are accomplished motivators as well. Is motivation an element of leadership? Because leaders are also sound planners, is planning part of the leadership concept?

Although planning, communicating, motivating, and decision making are enablers or facilitators of effective leadership, they are not leadership per se. In a general sense, leadership is the process whereby one individual influences other group members toward the attainment of defined group or organizational goals. In other words, the leadership role describes the relationship between the manager and his or her subordinates that results in the satisfactory execution of subordinates' assignments and, thereby, the attainment of the important goals for which the leader is responsible and is instrumental in setting. At the very minimum, leadership requires providing direction and impetus for subordinates to act in the desired direction (Muczyk & Adler, 2002).

As part of Project GLOBE, Javidan et al. (2006) found (a) certain universal facilitators of effective leadership, (b) universal impediments to effective leadership,

and (c) variables that are culturally contingent so far as leadership effectiveness is concerned. These are contained in Table 2. As has already been mentioned, facilitators may be important, but they are not to be confused with leadership itself.

An attempt was made by Muczyk and Adler (2002) not only to organize the different levels of abstraction but also to differentiate the leadership role from other managerial roles identified by Mintzberg (1973) and to distinguish leadership dimensions from leadership facilitators. Toward that end, an integrative framework was adopted that focuses on the distinct levels: transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and day-to-day or "small" leadership. Small leadership is transactional as well, but to a fault, and does not need to be discussed here because of its overlap with transactional leadership (Muczyk & Adler, 2002).

Transformational Leadership. Transformational leadership represents a set of behaviors that transform followers' commitment and energy beyond the minimum levels prescribed by the organization (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990). Given its nature, it is unlikely that transformational leadership differs much from culture to culture (Bass, 1997; Bass & Avolio, 1989; Geyer & Steyrer, 1994; Koene, Pennings, & Schuster, 1993; Koh, Steers, & Terborg, 1995; House, Hanges, Ruiz-Quintanilla, Dorfman, & Dickson, 1998; Javidan & Carl, 1997; Pereira, 1987). It is likely, however, that there are differences between national cultures so far as the enactment of transformational leadership is concerned.

Transactional (midrange) Leadership. Most transactional or midrange theories are predicated either explicitly or implicitly on the idea of a social compact between the leader and subordinates. That is, leaders construct an agenda and subordinates comply with it because there is a mutual benefit (Podsakoff et al., 1990). It is midrange leadership, more so than transformational leadership, that needs to be framed in a contingency or situational framework in order to have universal, practical value, because research evidence cited above suggests that transformational leadership is cross-cultural.

Unfortunately, when it comes to transactional leadership theories, there is a veritable embarrassment of riches. This poses two challenges that need to be addressed. First, to make midrange leadership theories more useful, especially to practitioners, the constituent components of leadership must be identified. Second, the controversy between normative (i.e., universal) and

situational (i.e., contingency) leadership must be resolved. The former is essential to distinguish the leadership role from the other managerial roles.

The reconciliation of normative and situational frameworks can be accomplished if we assume, and probably correctly, that midrange leadership theorists have been concerned with important, but entirely different, aspects of leadership. Some appear normative, whereas others appear situational. What is normative, however, depends on the cultural context. Yet, the constituent elements of leadership should be the same regardless of culture for the concept to be useful. This assumption in no way precludes differences so far as the enactment of the leadership elements in various cultures is concerned. The mainstream U.S. leadership dimensions follow. The first three are assumed to be normative or universals (Muczyk & Reimann, 1987):

1. *Consideration*—concern for people; good human relations; treating subordinates with courtesy, dignity, and respect; showing concern for subordinates' problems.
2. *Concern for production*—emphasis on challenging goals; achievement orientation; high standards.
3. *Incentive for performance*—the strongest performance–reward connection that organizational constraints will permit.

According to Muczyk and Reimann (1987), the situational or contingency aspects of leader behavior in North America are assumed to be the following:

4. *Participation or democratic leadership*—degree to which employees are involved in significant day-to-day, work-related decisions, including goal setting.
5. *Direction*—amount of follow-up or directive behavior associated with the execution of a decision once it has been made, or the attainment of a goal once it has been set.¹

In other words, the situational or contingency aspects of leader behavior concern themselves with (a) the decisions managers make and (b) the way these decisions are then executed. Leaders can differ in the extent to which they involve others as decisions are made. As a separate but related issue, leaders can vary in the amount of direction that they provide as those decisions are executed. A leader can be participatory or democratic by consulting employees during a decision-making and goal-setting phase; yet, he or she can still be directive by following up closely on progress toward the ends that have been mutually decided.

By combining the extreme points on the two situational continua, participation and direction, the

Table 3
Generic Profiles of Leader Behavior

	Extensive Employee Participation in Decision Making	No Employee Participation in Decision Making
Extensive directive behavior or follow-up on execution	Directive democrat	Directive autocrat
No directive behavior or follow-up on execution	Permissive democrat	Permissive autocrat

SOURCE: Adapted from Muczyk and Reimann (1989).

result is four “pure” patterns of leader behavior, as shown in Table 3. First, the *directive autocrat* makes decisions unilaterally and supervises the activities of subordinates very closely. Second, the *permissive autocrat* still makes the decisions alone but permits a great deal of latitude among subordinates in accomplishing their delegated tasks. Third, the *directive democrat* invites participation from subordinates in decision making but continues to supervise employees very closely to make certain they carry out their democratically assigned tasks properly. Fourth, the *permissive democrat* allows subordinates to participate in decision making and to enjoy a high degree of autonomy in executing the decisions.

Aligning National Cultural Attributes with The Muczyk and Reimann Midrange Theory of Leadership

The question that remains to be answered is whether the three normative dimensions in the model remain as universals when considering the global scene, or are all midrange leadership dimensions situational in a global frame of reference? If leadership needs to be aligned with characteristics of subordinates, business practices, and business strategies (Muczyk & Reimann, 1987, 1989; Muczyk & Steel, 1998), it is likely that it also needs to be aligned with salient cultural imperatives (Nadler, 2002). Consequently, we mapped the Project GLOBE cultural determinants of leadership onto Muczyk and Reimann's (1987) schema to fashion a global framework of leadership. This appears in Table 4. This map gives us the basis to offer recommendations to guide leadership.

Table 4
Aligning National Cultural Determinants
With the Muczyk and Reimann
Leadership Dimensions

Muczyk and Reimann Leadership Dimensions	Global Leadership Factors
Consideration	Assertiveness Gender differentiation Humane orientation
Concern for production	Uncertainty avoidance Performance orientation Time orientation Environmental orientation
Incentive for performance	Individualism–collectivism Performance orientation
Democracy–Autocracy	Power distance Individualism–collectivism Masculinity–femininity Uncertainty avoidance Perceived role hierarchy Environmental orientation Acceptability of bypassing the chain of command

NOTE: The amount of direction or permissiveness provided subordinates is a function of employee attributes and situational exigencies.

Leadership Dimensions as a Function of Cultural Imperatives

Autocratic Leadership

We should not assume that an autocrat is a misanthrope or ogre. Autocrats, instead, may be people who have been paid to make important decisions, set salient goals, and direct subordinates along the way. This approach to decision making and goal setting may be appropriate in cultures that are high in power distance, collectivism, masculinity, and uncertainty avoidance and that are characterized by external environmental orientation. Also, autocratic leadership might be more appropriate for societies whose members have a high regard for hierarchy and are reluctant to bypass the chain of command. According to Hofstede (1983), large power distance and collectivism appear to go together and generally characterize third-world countries. In times of crisis, an autocrat may be the most desired leader as well because subordinates tend to rally around decisive leaders during these times.

Democratic Leadership

This type of decision-making and goal-setting style 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. Also, this type of leadership might be suitable in societies whose members have a low regard for hierarchy and an inclination to bypass the chain of command. Hofstede (1983) revealed an association between small power distance and high individualism, and this combination typifies first-world nations.

Consideration

A modicum of consideration might be viewed as a universal requirement. Leaders, therefore, in societies that score high on assertiveness and masculinity and low on humane orientation would be expected to display some consideration. These leaders would be expected to display less consideration, however, when they are compared to leaders in societies that score high on femininity and humane orientation and low on assertiveness. Furthermore, in societies that are high on in-group collectivism, leaders might be encouraged to involve subordinates' family members in employer-sponsored social gatherings (Javidan & House, 2001).

Concern for Production

Like consideration, leaders in all countries would need to concern themselves with production if they and their organizations are to be competitive in a global marketplace. The concern for production, however, might be more salient for leaders in societies that avoid certainty and have an external environmental orientation. The need for these leaders to demonstrate concern for production might be emphasized further when these cultural attributes are coupled with short-term orientations.

Incentive for Performance

Fischer et al. (2007) have provided some preliminary evidence that organizations in different cultures (i.e., Germany, New Zealand, United States, and Brazil) use different reward systems. This study did not, however, offer specific guidance as to how these incentive systems could be best aligned to particular cultures. We posit that leaders in societies that score high on individualism and performance orientation might be served by reward systems that strongly link individual performance to rewards. On the other

Table 5
Examples of Regional Leadership Styles Based on Regional Cultural Determinants

Global Region	Regional Leadership Styles
United States and Canada	The Muczyk and Reimann (1987) model might apply and was discussed in an earlier part of the article.
Middle East	The recommended leadership style might be autocratic with heavy doses of concern for production and consideration. Rewards might be based on group and organizational performance measures rather than on individual measures. Furthermore, social functions might include family members. ^a
Asia (excluding Japan)	The preferred leadership style might be autocratic with an emphasis on consideration. Rewards might be based on group and/or organizational measures of performance.
Japan	Democratic leadership might be recommended with emphasis on consideration. There appears to be little need to tie rewards to performance because employees will do the right things because they are right not because of the rewards associated with correct behavior. Japan might be different from the rest Asia for two reasons. One, Japan is a group of islands and may have evolved differently because of self-imposed isolation for a lengthy period. Two, Japan might have changed significantly by the post–World War II U.S. occupation and its continuing relationship with the United States.
Western Europe	The leadership style recommended for the United States and Canada might be advocated for this region. For countries in which citizens respect hierarchy and chain of command, however, more autocratic leadership might be advisable
Eastern Europe	This region because of its recent history might call for heavy doses of autocratic leadership and concern for production. Rewards might be based on individual performance measures.
Southern Europe	Autocratic leadership might be recommended with heavy emphasis on consideration. A strong link might be created between rewards and group or organizational measures of performance.
Central and South America	Autocratic leadership with emphasis on concern for production might be suggested. Consideration should not be neglected, and rewards might be connected to group or organizational measures of performance.

SOURCE: Adapted from Javidan, Dorfman, de Luque, and House (2006); Koopman et al. (1999); Ronen and Shenkar (1985); Laurent (1983); and Brodbeck et al. (2000).

a. Suggested for cultures that are high on in-group collectivism, because members of these cultures take pride in small groups such as family, circle of close friends, and the organization for which they work.

hand, leaders in societies that are high on collectivism and low on performance orientation might focus on rewards that recognize group or organization-wide performance, especially in cultures that are high on in-group collectivism.

Examples Of Matching Leadership Dimensions with Regional Cultural Imperatives

A caveat is in order when attempting to cluster countries in accordance with the cultural determinants employed by Hofstede (1983) and Project GLOBE (Javidan & House, 2001). The two research streams, unfortunately, differ so far as rankings of certain countries. For instance, Hofstede ranks the United States at the very top of individualism, whereas Project GLOBE (Javidan & House, 2001) ranks the United States in the middle with regard to individualism. When such discrepancies occur, preference is

given to Project GLOBE because it is more comprehensive. By necessity, recommendations at this juncture—inspired by the research of Javidan et al. (2006), Koopman et al. (1999), Ronen and Shenkar (1985), Laurent (1983), and Brodbeck et al. (2000)—need to be tentative; these appear in Table 5. Please note that cultural differences occur within the regions depicted in Table 5 and more reliable leadership prescriptions require matching the specific cultural imperatives of a country with the leadership characteristics identified in this effort.

Several important issues emerge as the recommendations are examined. As an example, consider issues revolving around performance management. This process generally entails the establishment of performance objectives, operationalizing those objectives into measurable components, analyzing data that that have been captured, and rewarding those that fulfill objectives. Rewards, however, should be tailored based on national cultures (Nadler, 2002). We would suggest that leaders in the Middle East would be best

served if rewards were linked to measures of group or organizational performance. In Europe, leaders would want to link rewards to individual outcomes rather than to organizational outcomes. In contrast, rewards and incentives may not be at all important in a Japanese organization because employees tend to do the right things because they are right not because they are linked to specific rewards.

Conclusion

Although this undertaking is just the beginning regarding the formulation of a global leadership framework, enough research has already been conducted such that incorporating all the findings into a global contingency model would create such complexity as to make intellectual control extremely difficult, thereby frustrating and discouraging practitioners, researchers, and students. Implicit leadership theory (ILT) states that individuals hold a set of beliefs about the kinds of attributes, personality characteristics, skills, and behaviors that contribute to or impede effective leadership. This level of complexity already borders on information overload. Extending ILT to the cultural level of analysis, as was done by Javidan et al. (2006), makes intellectual control of the material highly impractical by anyone other than leadership scholars. Thus, it may be practical to include only the most important cultural imperatives in the determination of appropriate leadership style. Whenever there was a trade-off between the fidelity of a complex theory and the utility of a simplified version, the authors have opted for the latter. Furthermore, not all of the leadership characteristics are a function of cultural imperatives. Some are dictated by the attributes of subordinates and the requirements of the situation. These have been identified. Moreover, not all cultural predispositions are related to leadership in any way. Those that have been deemed irrelevant have been omitted.

The Muczyk and Reimann (1987) leadership model, which is based on research produced by U.S. scholars, contains three normative dimensions and two situational dimensions. So far as constructing a global model of leadership is concerned, however, all these dimensions are considered to be situational (i.e., contingent on cultural imperatives, subordinate attributes, and demands of the situation in question). Four of the five leadership qualities are then matched with the cultural imperatives identified by Project GLOBE (Javidan & House, 2001) to produce tentative leadership prescriptions for different parts of the world and

for specific nations. The direction-permissiveness dimension is a function of subordinate attributes and the demands of the situation in question.

Finally, the thrust of this undertaking assumes that leaders are flexible and are capable of changing their leadership styles to suit a particular culture in which they are working. This is a heroic assumption. It may very well be that organizations will have to place greater reliance on selecting the kind of individuals that global leadership requires. That is to say, it may not be wise to ignore the predispositions of the leaders. Instead, their dispositions might be considered and aligned with the appropriate cultures so that organizations can capitalize on inherent strengths.

Of course, the contingency model that we describe offers several opportunities for researchers. First, there is a need to further ascertain the reliability, validity, and usefulness of the prescriptions offered. This would require constructing an appropriate instrument measuring the constructs embodied in this model, administering the instrument, obtaining performance measures, and conducting suitable analysis. Until that is done, this effort is just a modest beginning. Second, researchers can examine specific contexts in which successful leadership would be needed. Leading organizational change is one particular area. It is difficult to overestimate the prepotency of change as a driving force in contemporary organizations. Moreover, the necessity of leaders to respond appropriately to the radical changes that are buffeting organizations will continue to be salient. Accordingly, Yukl, Gordon, and Tabor (2002) have included leading change with task and relations as vital leadership behavior dimensions. Clearly, the alignment of such activities as monitoring the external environment, envisioning change, encouraging innovative thinking, and taking personal risks with the appropriate culture should occupy more of researchers' time.

In sum, our initial step toward a contingency model of global leadership serves practitioners and researchers alike. For practitioners, the cultural alignment of leadership may help leaders guide organizational activities and develop social capital. This may also help leaders anticipate problems that may arise with policies that cut across cultures. For researchers, we have suggested a speculative framework that can be tested. Specifically, studies examining leadership antecedents and outcomes in specific leadership settings that require cross-cultural leadership can be conducted (e.g., leading change in a multinational firm). Although our efforts are preliminary, they offer practitioners and researchers meaningful insights into the adaptation of leadership to a national culture.

Note

1. Initiating structure in the context of the Ohio State leadership research stream is attained more through the follow-up or directive behavior dimension than through the concern for production dimension. In addition, issues such as how narrowly defined and how detailed are the job descriptions and the extent to which jobs are informed by rules, regulations, and procedures (i.e., role formalization) contribute to initiating structure but are part of the organizational structure dimension and not part of the leadership construct per se.

References

- Bass, B. M. (1997). Does the transactional-transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries? *American Psychologist*, *52*, 130-139.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1989). *Manual: The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Batson, A. (2007, June 20). China's new rules grant workers more protection. *Wall Street Journal*, p. A3.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: Wiley.
- Brodbeck, F. C., Frese, M., Akerblom, S., Audia, G., Bakacsi, G., Bendova, H., et al. (2000). Cultural variation of leadership prototypes across 22 European countries. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *73*, 1-29.
- Deluga, R. J. (1992). The relationship of leader-member exchanges with laissez-faire, transactional, and transformational leadership in naval environments. In K. E. Clark, M. B. Clark, & D. R. Campbell (Eds.), *Impact of leadership* (pp. 237-247). Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.
- Early, P. C. (1993, April). East meets West meets Mideast: Further exploration of collectivistic and individualistic work groups. *Academy of Management Journal*, pp. 319-348.
- Fischer, R., Smith, P. B., Richey, B., Ferreira, M. C., Assmar, E. M. L., Maes, J., et al. (2007). How do organizations allocate rewards? *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *38*, 3-18.
- Geyer, A. L. J., & Steyrer, J. (1994). Transformational Führung, Klassische Führungstheorien und Erfolgsindikatoren von Bankbetrieben [Transformational leadership, classic leadership theories, and performance in banks]. *Zeitschrift Fuer Betriebswirtschaft*, *64*, 961-979.
- Hofstede, G. (1983, Fall). The cultural relativity of organizational practices and theories. *Journal of International Business Studies*, p. 82.
- House, R. J. P., Hanges, A., Ruiz-Quintanilla, P., Dorfman, M., & Dickson, M. (in press). Cultural influences on leadership and organizations: Project GLOBE. In W. Mobbley (Ed.), *Advances in global leadership*. Greenwich, CT: JAI.
- Howell, J. M., & Hall-Merenda, K. E. (1999). The impact of leader-member exchange, transformational and transactional leadership, and distance on predicting follower performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *84*, 680-694.
- Javidan, M., & Carl, D. (1997). *Motivational consequences of charismatic leadership: An empirical investigation*. Working Paper, School of Business Administration, University of Calgary.
- Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., de Luque, M. S., & House, R. (2006, February). In the eye of the beholder: Cross cultural lessons in leadership from Project GLOBE. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, pp. 67-90.
- Javidan, M., & House, R. J. (2001). Cultural acumen for the global manager: Lessons from Project GLOBE. *Organizational Dynamics*, *29*, 289-305.
- Kluckhohn, F. R., & Strodtbeck, F. L. (1961). *Variations in value orientations*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Koene, H., Pennings, H., & Schreuder, M. (1993). Leadership, culture, and organizational Effectiveness. In K. E. Clark & M. B. Clark (Eds.), *The impact of leadership*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.
- Koh, W. L., Steers, R. M., & Terborg, J. R. (1995). The effects of transformational leadership on teacher attitudes and student performance in Singapore. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *16*, 319-334.
- Koopman, P. L., Den Hartog, D. N., Konrad, E., Akerblom, S., Audia, G., Bakacsi, G., et al. (1999). National culture and leadership profiles in Europe: Some results from the GLOBE study. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *8*, 503-520.
- Laurent, A. (1983, Spring-Summer). The cultural diversity of Western conceptions of management. *International Studies of Management and Organizations*, 75-96.
- Mines, M., & Gourishankar, V. (1990). Leadership and individuality in South Asia: The case of the South Indian Big-man. *Journal of Asian Studies*, *49*, 761-786.
- Mintzberg, H. (1973). *The nature of managerial work*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Muczyk, J. P. (2003). What persons wishing to do business in the Middle East need to know: Lessons learned by an expatriate living in the Middle East. In S. Fullerton & D. Moore (Eds.), *International business trends: Contemporary readings*, pp. 103-108. Ypsilanti, MI: Academy of Business Administration.
- Muczyk, J. P., & Adler, T. (2002). An attempt at a consensience regarding formal leadership. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, *9*(2), 2-17.
- Muczyk, J. P., & Reimann, B. C. (1987). The case for directive leadership. *Academy of Management Executive*, *1*, 301-311.
- Muczyk, J. P., & Reimann, B. C. (1989). MBO as a complement to effective leadership. *Academy of Management Executive*, *3*, 131-138.
- Muczyk, J. P., & Steel, R. P. (1998, March-April). Leadership style and the turnaround executive. *Business Horizons*, 39-45.
- Nadler, N. (2002). *International dimensions of organizational behavior* (4th ed.). Cincinnati, OH: Southwestern.
- Pereira, D. (1987). *Factors associated with transformational leadership in an Indian engineering firm*. Paper presented at Administrative Science Association of Canada, Vancouver.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, *1*, 107-142.
- Ronen, S., & Shenkar, O. (1985, July). Clustering countries on attitudinal dimensions: A review and synthesis. *Academy of Management Review*, p. 449.
- Trompenaars, F., & Hamden-Turner, C. (1998). *Riding the waves of culture* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Walumbwa, F. O., Lawler, J. J., & Avolio, B. J. (2007). Leadership, individual differences, and work-related attitudes: A cross cultural investigation. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, *56*, 212-230.

Yukl, G., Gordon, A., & Taber, T. (2002). A hierarchical taxonomy of leadership behavior: Integrating a half century of behavior research. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 9(1), 15-32.

Jan P. Muczyk is professor emeritus at the Air Force Institute of Technology (AFIT), Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio. He is the former dean of the Graduate School of Logistics and Acquisition Management and the former chair of Executive Education, AFIT. He has spent 30 years in civilian universities in the United States and abroad. His research has appeared in the

Academy of Management Executive, *Academy of Management Review*, and *Personnel Psychology*. His current research interests include leadership and strategic organizational issues.

Daniel T. Holt is an active-duty Air Force officer and assistant professor of management at the Air Force Institute of Technology at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio. He has served as an Air Force civil engineer in Central America, Asia, and throughout the Middle East. His research interests focus on organizational change and development, human resource management issues, and measurement theory.