

The Influence of Leadership on National Culture

(Comparison of Different Leadership Traits)

Dr. Rajeshwari Malik

Maharaja Surajmal Institute
Rajmalik2007@gmail.com

Abstract— Leadership and followership are very essential factors for national development and achievement of organizational goal. Leadership and followership is a major universal challenge to all nation States; while some countries have overcome the primitive or dictatorial stage to propel their economy and social welfare of her people to a comfortable level; other emerging developing economy are still reeling to grow above the challenges of impotent leadership and followership syndrome. This paper discusses Leadership from the macro level. It looks into the concept of leadership, Types, qualities, functions and problems of leadership from the India perspective and the relationship between Leadership and followership. The paper is aimed at enlightening political leaders and their followers of their responsibilities, and promoting good governance in India. This paper recommend that, leadership and followership relationship should always be harmonized as to enable the society or group to achieve her vision and set goal. Leadership and followership should adopt a new paradigm shift were values, and leadership traits, integrity and other discussed qualities herein will serve as the basis for consideration or conceding Leadership. Consensus selection of leaders should be avoided; Leaders should be elected through democratic and transparent process.

Keywords— Leadership, Followership, National Culture, Development, Economic growth

I. INTRODUCTION

Leadership is a sacred responsibility. It is for those who possess the spirit of sacrifice and selflessness. It is the ability of the individual to successfully direct the activities of the group to the attainment of organizational or national goals (Agwaranze, 1997). Leadership, according to Fayemi (2008) is “the ability to take an initiative, to motivate, to influence, to direct and control the thoughts, the opinions and the actions of the follows in any given society towards the achievement of purposeful desired ends”. In China, we see that Mao’s rule was closely associated with poor economic growth, averaging 1.7 percent per year. After his death, growth averaged 5.9 percent per year. The Cultural Revolution and the forced collectivization of agriculture were among many national policies that likely limited growth during Mao’s rule, while Deng, who came to power in 1978, is often regarded as having moved China towards more market-oriented policies. While the dramatic change in growth after Mao’s death may suggest leader effects, this is one example and it could be a coincidence. Jones and Olken (2005) analyze 57 cases of 6 natural and accidental deaths in the world sample and test, on average, whether growth changes in an unusual fashion when leaders die. Do leadership decides the destiny of a nation?

Also, does leadership shape the culture of a nation? Through this paper, the author tries to explore the relationship between leadership and national culture.

II. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Leadership is defined in various ways. We shall examine some of the definitions and apply them to this study. Bryman (1992) in Ngwube (2010) defined Leadership as *a process of social influence whereby a Leader steers members of a group towards a goal*. Leadership here involves influence. It is concerned with how the Leader affects followers and the leader is the focal point. Fafowora et al (1995) also see leadership as implying *a purposeful direction of the affairs of the Led*. Leadership is all about influence here too. Northouse (2010) defined leadership as *a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal*.

Tannenbaum and Thom-Otuya (2007) defined Leadership as *interpersonal influence exercised in situation and directed through communication process, toward the attainment of goals*. Utomi(2004) defined Leadership as the art of mobilizing in a least cost manner to achieve a clear goal. Stogdill, Irikana and Orisa(2007) defined Leadership as the process of influencing the activities of an organized group towards goal setting and goal achievement. R.J House and Thom Otuya(2007),described leadership as the ability of an individual to influence, motivate, and enable others to contribute toward the effectiveness and success of the organization of which they are members. According to Newman (1997) leadership is the special and unique ability to influence people to move towards goals that are beneficial and meet the group’s best interests. In this paper, leadership will be seen as one who is in a position of integrity or trust, direct and conduct the affairs of a group or group of persons, influencing their behavior and decisions towards complying to the achievement of some desired goals. Leadership therefore involves the element or skills of: vision, motivation, integrity, initiative, courage and successfully mobilizing an organization or group of persons towards a goal.

President Corazon Aquino of Philippines (Thom-Otuya, 2007) qualified leadership with its alphabet related acronym. They are:

L – Leadership is love of and loyalty to God, Country and People.

E – It is enthusiasm energetic effort to help and serve others.
 A – It is action, accomplishment.
 D – It is dedication, discipline, dignity, decency, devotion to duty, decisiveness for the general welfare.
 E – It is excellence, exemplary work for others to follow and emulate.
 R – It is reliability, responsibility; respect for the law and the right of others, reconciliation for peace and unity.
 S – It is sincerity, service, self-sacrifice, social justice to make life better for mankind.
 H – It is humility, honesty, honor, helpfulness, hardwork for accomplishment and fulfillment.
 I – It is integrity, interest, initiative, and idealism.
 P – Finally leadership is patience, perseverance, beyond partisanship, religion or creed; it works for peace, progress and prosperity of mankind.

Types of Leadership: There are various classification (or types) of Leadership. The common classifications/ types of Leadership according to majority of authors are:

1. *Autocratic* (boss centered) Leadership: in this type of Leadership the leader makes decisions on his own without consulting others. This type of leadership is also called ‘dictatorial’. In this context, the leader assumes monopoly of knowledge. He is personal in his praises and criticisms of individuals but remains aloof from the group. The leader decrees what will be done and the followers have no choice but to accept it. All the military regimes in India are good examples of a dictatorial leadership.
2. *Democratic* (subordinate centered) Leadership: is one in which the leader invites the participation of subordinates or followers in decisions that affect them. This type of leader is characterized by his concern for the achievement of set goals with the group. He is sensitive and understands the need of the individual, groups within the organization and helps them to fulfill their needs as well as the functions of the group.
3. *Laissez-Faire* (free-reign) Leadership: is a leader that leaves many of the decisions up to the subordinates or followers to make. He gives his subordinates a “free reign” over their activities; has little or no attempt to evacuate or regulate the members of the group of their progress towards achieving their goals and objectives. In most cases, the laissez-faire leaders can be said to be enjoying leadership of position and not that of functions.

Followership can be described as adherence to a leader. But in this exposition, followership is the virtue of supporting leaders and helping them to lead well. For followers to help their leaders do well, they have a responsibility to actively participate in the achievement of a nation’s goal. Jehn and Bezrukova (2003) contended that followership is a people oriented behavior, and this behavior builds relationships between leaders and followers, providing an environment that promotes all organizational members to focus on a common goal. Both authors suggested that good followers may be a catalyst for change in an organization as

followership “inspires others to follow toward a common goal; creates enthusiasm and desire to excel; fully engages others, build confidence; moves the organization ahead as one entity rather than separate parts” Jehn and Bezrukova(2013).

III. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Qualities of Good Followership: Irikana and Orisa (2007) described the qualities of good followership as total obedience to the laws of the land or constituted authorities. He said it requires loyalty or allegiance to the leadership, eschew indiscipline in any form or shapes, and explore channels of grievance resolution along with commitment to goals and aspiration of the country. Werlin (2012) contended that good followership relationships must build on motivation rather than control, and that instilling values into followers is essentially to develop a culture of trust and good relationship. He asserted that, the balance of power between leader and follower; however, must be maintained in order to provide a culture of openness that promotes self engagement.

National Development is defined by Lawal and Oluwatoyin(2011) as the overall development or a collective socio-economic, political as well as religious advancement of a country or nation. However in this paper, it will be describe as the ability of a country or countries to improve the social welfare of the people, by providing social amenities like quality education, potable water, transportation, infrastructure, medical care, etc.

According to Irikana and Orisa(2007) some basic qualities expected of a good leader are: (1) Intelligence (2) Self Control (3) Sociability (4) Integrity (5) Honesty (6) Patriotism (7) Courage (8) Foresight (9) Oratory ability (10) Alertness and (11) Empathy. A leader that possesses these qualities must enjoy, obedience, support and positive followership of his people, and will be attuned to high compliance in the achievement of his set goals, and effective in dispensation of justice and public welfare.

Functions of Leadership: Leadership functions are very numerous and articulated differently by various author, but all pointing to the ability of a Leader to mobilize his people to achieve a set goal. These functions of Leaders are: *Taking initiative:* constitutes the most fundamental function of Leadership. A leader must be creative and logical enough in other to take action for every situation that confronts him. Initiators of action in an organization or states become history’s most important Leaders. Taking initiative in detecting and remediating problems distinguishes leaders in many modern organizations and nation-states.

Evaluating Followers Needs, Aspiration, and Capabilities: for Leadership to command high followership there must be deliberate attempt by leadership to motivate their followers. Every person need hope to survive, and motivation has to do with the leader understanding the needs

of his follower. Understanding the needs of your followers has to do with another leadership skill of patiently listening to your followers. It equally involves knowledge of their capabilities, including energy, endurance and commitment. Irikana and Orisa(2007) noted that, a purposeful and insightful leader creates new ideas, project discussion, etc and positively and invariably lead others in the group to develop or carry out the tasks.

Fostering and maintaining Communication: It is one of the leading functions of a leader. Leaders initiate instrumental relationships when they assign people to work in teams and task forces or appoint ministers, commissioners, advisers, etc. It is the task of a leader to prevent fragmentation and foster cooperation and team work amongst his subordinates and followers; this can be done through effective communication. Effective communication reduces doubt and suspicion among groups; sustain followers' interest and participation in group action or policy adoption and implementation.

Representing Members' Aspirations and Values: one of the consistent noted function of leadership has been the expression and symbolization of their followers' aspiration and values. In developed societies, leadership role is assigned to people believed to reflect the values and aspirations of members. Some author will refer to this as implementation of group philosophy. To achieve this (Irikana & Orisa), rules and regulations are stated and implemented. This is to guide against conflict of interest among the group, and for the general good to prevail at all times.

Providing Resources: command of resources both material and non material promotes the exercise of leadership and compels the loyalty of followership. The entrepreneur who provides capital to Start-up Company attains influence over its operators. Strategic plans formulated by executives also constitute resources, providing direction to the Management team that work under them. In war, strategy itself becomes a crucial resource. In politics, followership expects one reward or the other from their leaders. Leaders process or facilitate the passage of a budget so that, they have both material and non material resources to provide for their followers. Followers also become more loyal to leadership as soon as budget has been passed so that, they can be involved in the material gain of implementing the budget.

There are nine roles important at senior strategic levels because they help leaders understand what to do to be strategic. These challenges include factors such as their increased span of influence, loss of tactical control, broader consequences of failure, the business scope they are addressing, their own visibility, and a greater variety in stakeholders they need to satisfy. Following are the nine key strategic leadership roles and brief definitions of each.

NAVIGATOR—Clearly and quickly works through the complexity of key issues, problems and opportunities to affect actions (e.g., leverage opportunities and resolve issues).

STRATEGIST—Develops a long-range course of action or set of goals to align with the organization's vision.

ENTREPRENEUR—Identifies and exploits opportunities for new products, services, and markets.

MOBILIZER—Proactively builds and aligns stakeholders, capabilities, and resources for getting things done quickly and achieving complex objectives.

TALENT ADVOCATE—Attracts, develops, and retains talent to ensure that people with the right skills and motivations to meet business needs are in the right place at the right time.

CAPTIVATOR—Builds passion and commitment toward a common goal.

GLOBAL THINKER—Integrates information from all sources to develop a well-informed, diverse perspective that can be used to optimize organizational performance.

CHANGE DRIVER—Creates an environment that embraces change; makes change happen—even if the change is radical—and helps others to accept new ideas.

ENTERPRISE GUARDIAN—Ensures shareholder value through courageous decision-making that supports enterprise—or unit-wide interests.

Strategic leaders are not typically engaged in all nine roles “all the time,” they will often be involved in situations related to more than one role at any given time. The relative importance placed on each role is dependent upon the business situation in which the leader is engaged. Thus, in one situation a strategic leader may initially be focused on developing a long range course of action or set of goals to align with the organization's vision. The focus might then subsequently shift to building passion and commitment toward those goals among the people who need to take ownership of the strategy or vision. The nine roles have general applicability across all senior leadership positions, and are not unique to any particular job; however, the particular focus on any given role at a point in time will be determined by the business issues being addressed at that time. Ideally, an executive team would collectively represent capabilities across the full spectrum of these roles.

Several factors will determine a leader's success or failure in meeting these challenges, such as his or her underlying skills or leadership competencies, knowledge, experience etc. Just because leaders have been highly successful in operational/functional roles doesn't ensure their success as senior strategic leaders. Yet organizations routinely rely on these very people to move into these critical roles. The result—senior strategic leaders who are unprepared to effectively deal with the situations and challenges they must face. Through the powerful content and hands-on leadership simulation of Strategic Leadership Experience, participants will learn how to think and act more strategically—to strategize ways to grow the business, gain acceptance of their

strategies, and execute them to achieve desired business results.

VI. NATIONAL CULTURE

Cultural problems have not become so apparent and delicate, for the world, today only. They have drawn the interest of many researchers for many years, bringing about the realization of many important studies, in size and scope, as well as in a representative capacity and actuality of (their) results. But, even though many researchers accept the influence of culture in organizational values and attitudes they very rarely go as far as to empirically confirm these relations. Hofstede (1980; 1991) has identified four major dimensions of national culture: uncertainty avoidance, individualism/collectivism, masculinity/ femininity, and power distance. Uncertainty avoidance is a lack of tolerance for ambiguity. Individualism versus collectivism refers to a need for getting ahead versus a need to belong. The masculinity/femininity dimension is Hofstede's code for a preference for domination versus cooperation in superior/subordinate relationships. Power distance describes a preference for, or tolerance of, inequality.

Hofstede (1991) and Hickson and Pugh (1995) have linked these cultural dimensions to organizational behavior. They found that high power distance is associated with strong authority and steep hierarchies, and that uncertainty avoidance is associated with formalization. Hofstede's (1980) framework has been criticized on both empirical and theoretical grounds (e.g., one time, single company data; dimensions derived from factor analysis). Nevertheless, on balance, Hofstede's framework has been largely validated (e.g., Sondergaard, 1994) and provides a reasonable representation of national cultural attributes (see also Hickson, 1996). In addition, it seems obvious that board structure is also influenced by differences in countries' economic, political and legal systems (e.g., Roe, 1993). This study, however, was restricted to cultural differences as a first step. Country-level economic development was also included as a control in the models. Kroeber, Kluckhohn, Untereiner, & Meyer (1952) identified over 160 definitions of the term culture, selecting one of the widely cited definitions, offered by B. Tylor, "that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society."

Later on Kluckhohn & Kelly (1945) have referred to cultures as "all the historically created designs for living, explicit and implicit, rational, irrational, and non-rational, which exist at any given time as potential guides for the behavior of men." While Herskovits spoke of culture as being "the man-made part of the environment" and Downs (1971) defined culture as being "a mental map which guides us in our relations to our surroundings and to other people." If the nation would be personified with the organism of a human

being, then people would be its cells, while groups of individuals would constitute the different organs of the body that interact continuously with one-another for the organism to live. Viewed from this perspective "Culture is an integral composed of partly autonomous, partly coordinated institutions. It is integrated with a series of principles such as the community of blood through procreation; the specialization in activities; and last but not least, the use of power in political organization.

Each culture owes its completeness and self-sufficiency to the fact that it satisfies the whole range of basic, instrumental and integrative needs." (Malinowski, 1969, p. 40) "Thus culture is our roots and the foundation of our family, community and society." (Banutu-Gomez, 2002, p. 30) Culture is everything which identifies and differentiates a group of people living together at the same place (as geographical location), speaking the same language, and passing through the same historical developments. "Culture is not a 'thing' which can be experienced directly through the senses, just as 'needs', 'social systems', 'evil' and 'peace' are not European Scientific Journal April 2013 edition vol.9, No.11 ISSN: 1857 – 7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857- 7431 163 directly tangible or visible. They are ideas constructed within a society. 'Culture' does not exist in a simple and easily defined form for a specifiable number of people in a bounded area." (Hoecklin, 1995, p. 24) In an intriguing way culture appears as comprehensive as much as dismissive. Exploring it you see how simple things turn into complicated and complicated things turn into simple ones. According to Chhokar, Brodbeck, & House, (2007) culture and leadership even though the most written about topics, are still the least understood ones in the social sciences. The authors consider them very challenging, as well as very important for satisfying human existence. Culture is a social construct that we do not inherit genetically but socially from our predecessors, pass it to our children, and in this way we teach culture in society. rationale that connect behavior to outcomes. People need a secure sense that they understand how the world works in order to behave confidently and consistently." This finds approval also from The Manjako ethnic group in The Gambia, Guinea-Bissau and Senegal, who defines culture as our world of yesterday, our world of today and our world of tomorrow which creates and nurture cooperation, development and sustainability among our people in our society.

V. CONCLUSION

We can conclude that, Leadership is a process, not a property of a person. he process involves a particular form of influence called motivating. The nature of the incentives, extrinsic or intrinsic, is not part of the definition. The consequence of the influence is collaboration in pursuit of a common goal. The "great things" are in the minds of both leader and followers and are not necessarily viewed as desirable by all other parties. Leadership was assumed to be a general personal trait independent of the context in which the leadership was performed. We refer to this as a heroic conception of

leadership. Heroic models originated in the great man theory of history proposed by 18th-century rationalists such as Carlyle, Nietzsche, and Galton. Major events in world history were assumed to be the result of great men whose genius and vision changed the world in which they lived. Among psychologists, William James (1880) stressed that the mutations of society were due to great men who led society in the directions they believed to be important. The development of psychological testing in the early part of the 20th century provided the potential for testing the trait concept. If leadership is a general personal trait, it should be measurable, and people with a high level of this trait could be placed in positions requiring their talents. If the heroic model proved to be correct, society could enormously benefit through improved leader selection.

Finally, we can conclude that leadership plays a key role in development of a nation. Majority of the papers analyzed had identified three distinct roles that situational variables play in the leadership process and its effectiveness in shaping the national culture.

1. **Organizational effectiveness** (often taken to be an indication of its leadership) is affected by situational factors not under leader control like the actions of competitors, enactment of new legislation, new technologies, interest rates, and currency fluctuations (to name just a few variables). All of these factors can have large effects on organizational effectiveness, making it difficult to discern leadership effects. It is these direct effects of situation that are one of the principal bases for what we have termed the pure-situational theory and have led some to conclude that leadership is entirely illusory.

2. **Situations shape how leaders behave.** Leaders, are affected by their environment as well as by fairly stable characteristics that predispose them to certain kinds of behavior. Unfortunately, the field of leadership has identified more closely with the field of individual differences and has largely ignored the way the behavior of leaders is influenced by the situations they encounter. The heroic model, with its search for a general trait of leadership, as well as the investigations of leader behavior at Ohio State University and the University of Michigan assumed a degree of invariance across situations that is seldom, if ever, observed.

3. Situations influence the **consequences of leader behavior.** Popular books on management are filled with maxims such as push decision power down, delegate; enlarge jobs, place your trust in people, the customer must come first, and so on. Each of these maxims is situation free. The advice is unfettered with information about the kinds of situations in which the recommended actions are effective and those in which they are ineffective. Clearly, normative theories require situational qualifiers. Actions must be tailored to fit the demands of each situation.

A leadership style that is effective in one situation may prove completely ineffective in a different situation. Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1958) stimulated thinking about the possibility of developing a contingency model of leadership by suggesting a wide range of situational factors that should be

considered by managers in adopting a leadership style. Hersey and Blanchard (1982) carried the process one step further by proposing a taxonomy of four styles ranging from telling to delegating and a framework for matching each to the situation. However, their one situational variable—the maturity of followers—essentially ignored other important features of the context within which the interaction took place. The normative models of Vroom, Yetton, and Jago represent more ambitious attempts to model the interaction between leadership style, situation, and effectiveness outcomes. In their research, the situational variables used in predicting the consequences of a leader's choices are the same as those used in explaining the choices that a leader actually makes. The advantage of using the same situational variables in both normative and descriptive analyses is the ease with which the effectiveness of a leader's choices can be determined. One can compare a leader's choices in each situation with the choice recommended by the normative model. In this way, the overall effectiveness of a leader's choice can be determined as well as the source of his or her ineffectiveness. Participation in decision making is but one of many dimensions of leader behavior that can be studied in the manner that we have used here.

Viewing leadership in purely dispositional or purely situational terms is to miss a major portion of the phenomenon. Earlier in this article, we defined leadership as a process of motivating others to work together collaboratively to accomplish great things. The task confronting contingency theorists is to understand the key behaviors and contextual variables involved in this process. Looking at behavior in specific classes of situations rather than averaging across situations is more consistent with contemporary research on personality and more conducive to valid generalizations about effective leadership.

REFERENCES

- [1] Ashour, A. S. (1973). The contingency model of leadership effectiveness: An evaluation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 9, 339–355.
- [2] Avolio, B. J. (2007). Promoting more integrative strategies for leadership theory building. *American Psychologist*, 62, 25–33.
- [3] Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership* (3rd ed.). New York: Free Press.
- [4] Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper.
- [5] Blake, R., & Mouton, J. (1964). *The managerial grid*. Houston, TX: Gulf.
- [6] Brown, F. W., & Finstuen, K. (1993). The use of participation in decision making: A consideration of the Vroom–Yetton and Vroom–Jago normative models. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 6, 207–219.
- [7] Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper Torchbooks. Cohen, M. D., & March, J. G. (1974). *Leadership and ambiguity: The American college president*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- [8] Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1998). *Charismatic leadership in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- [9] Evans, M. G. (1996). R. J. House's "A path-goal theory of leader effectiveness." *The Leadership Quarterly*, 7, 305–309.
- [10] Fiedler, F., & Chemers, M. M. (1984). *Improving leadership effectiveness: The leader match concept* (Rev. ed.). New York: Wiley.
- [11] Hackman, J. R., & Wageman, R. (2007). Asking the right questions about leadership. *American Psychologist*, 62, 43–47.
- [12] James, W. (1880, October). Great men, great thoughts and their environment. *Atlantic Monthly*, 46, 441–459. Kerr, S. (1974). Discussant comments. In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (Eds.), *Contingency approaches to leadership* (pp. 124–129). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- [13] Pfeffer, J. (1977). The ambiguity of leadership. *Academy of Management Review*, 2, 104–112.
- [14] Podolny, J. M., Khurana, R., & Hill-Popper, M. (2005). Revisiting the meaning of leadership. In B. M. Staw & R. M. Kramer (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 26, pp. 1–36).
- [15] Sternberg, R. J. (2007). A systems models of leadership: WICS. *American Psychologist*, 62, 34–42.
- [16] Tannenbaum, R. E., & Schmidt, W. H. (1958, March/April). How to choose a leadership pattern. *Harvard Business Review*, 36, 95–101.
- [17] Vroom, V. H. (2000). Leadership and the decision-making process. *Organizational Dynamics*, 28(4), 82–94.
- [18] Vroom, V. H. (2003). Educating managers in decision making and leadership. *Management Decision*, 10, 968–978.
- [19] Zaccaro, S. J. (2007). Trait-based leadership. *American Psychologist*, 62, 6–16.